



## City Of Sedona Community Development Department

102 Roadrunner Drive Sedona, AZ 86336

(928) 282-1154 • [www.sedonaaz.gov/cd](http://www.sedonaaz.gov/cd)

---

### Memorandum

**TO:** Planning and Zoning Commission  
**FROM:** Cari Meyer, Planning Manager  
**MEETING DATE:** February 6, 2024  
**SUBJECT:** Continued Public Hearing; Village at Saddlerock Crossing (PZ19-00005 (ZC, DEV))

---

Planning and Zoning Commission held a public hearing for the Village at Saddlerock Crossing project (PZ19-00005 (ZC, DEV)) on November 7, 2023. The packet materials for that meeting can be reviewed at the following link:

<https://www.sedonaaz.gov/your-government/meetings-documents/-folder-5634>

In the Staff Report for that meeting, Staff's evaluation of the project concluded with a recommendation of denial of the project based on lack of compliance with ordinance requirements, inconsistency with the Sedona Community Plan, Soldiers Pass CFA Plan, Transportation Master Plan, GO! Sedona Pathways Plan, Climate Action Plan, the Land Development Code, and the requirements for approval, as detailed in the attached Staff Report and accompanying exhibits.

After conducting the public hearing during which the Planning and Zoning Commission heard presentations from and asked questions of both Staff and the applicant, heard public comment, and had the opportunity to discuss among themselves, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted to continue the Public Hearing to February 6, 2024, to allow the applicant the opportunity to address the deficiencies of the project noted in the Staff Report.

Based on the feedback from the Staff Report and the Commission, the applicant submitted revised plans on January 4, 2024. Due to the stage of the project and the timeframes needed to get back to the Commission on February 6, there was not an opportunity for staff to provide separate comments to the applicant on the revised plans. Staff sent the applicant and the Commission the revised comments at the same time. The revised plans (along with all previous iterations of the plans) can be reviewed online at the following link:

<https://www.sedonaaz.gov/your-government/departments/community-development/projects-and-proposals/the-village-at-saddlerock-crossing-oxford-hotel>

Other than multiple clean up items that contribute to the legibility and clarity of the plans, the biggest changes are summarized as follows:

- A vehicular connection to Elk Road has been added through the parking structure. (Required by the Land Development Code as well as the Community Plan, CFA Plan, and other adopted plans).
- The 3' gravel path on the west side of Elk Road has been changed to a 5' wide concrete sidewalk.
- The parking areas have been reconfigured to add the required loading spaces.
- Additional bicycle parking has been provided.
- All buildings will be solar ready.

- Building heights and design have been adjusted to ensure closer compliance with height requirements, but there remains unanswered height details.
- Additional information has been provided in the project narratives addressing how the development is proposing to meet the goals of the Community Plan, CFA plan, and other adopted plans.

Based on these revised plans, Staff has updated the Community Focus Area Checklist and the Land Development Code Checklist for the project (Attachments 1 and 2). Without restating the entire evaluation of the project that was provided in the staff report for the November 7, 2023 meeting (the Commission is encouraged to use the link provided to review that evaluation), Staff provides the following updates (page numbers based on page number of packet for November 7, 2023 meeting). If an item does not have an update below, the Commission should assume that the original evaluation of the project is unchanged.

- **Page 7**

- LDC Section 2.16: L: Lodging: The application of setbacks and the calculation of lot coverage is still unclear.
- LDC Section 2.24: Measurements and Exceptions: While the project mostly complies with height requirements, there are still unanswered height details. If the project is approved, there are a number of details that would need to be resolved at the building permit stage.
- LDC Section 5.4: Access, Connectivity, and Circulation: The plans were amended to provide vehicular and pedestrian access to Elk Road as well as a full sidewalk along Elk Road. If approved, public easements will be needed to ensure the access and connectivity remains open to the public.

- **Page 8**

- LDC Section 5.5: Off-Street Parking and Loading: Staff's outstanding questions around the parking analysis haven't been fully addressed, primarily around the appropriateness of the reductions claimed in the analysis. The questions may be addressed through a Development Agreement, as it ultimately is reliant on how the parking areas, restaurant reservations, and use of the meeting space is managed, which has never been explained. The Director has not approved any reduction in parking requirements for the conference space. Additionally, loading spaces and additional bicycle parking spaces have been added to the plans.
- LDC Section 5.6: Landscaping, Buffering, and Screening: Additional information has been provided to show how landscape areas are being measured. Additional trash and recycling enclosures have been added. Screening of loading areas would need to be reviewed at the building permit stage of the project.
- LDC Section 5.7: Site and Building Design: Guest room buildings have been slightly redesigned, which brought them out of compliance with massing requirements. Portions of windows and doors being used to meet building articulation requirements are behind building walls. If the project is approved, the applicant would need to modify plans to ensure all requirements are met.

- LDC Section 5.8: Outdoor Lighting: An updated lighting plan for the bottom floor of the parking structure has not been provided. In addition, sign lighting has not been added to the lighting application.
- LDC Article 6: Signs: A master sign plan that meets the requirements of Article 6 has not been provided.
- **Pages 9-16: Discussion (Zone Change)**
  - The addition of a connection to Elk Road along with 5' sidewalks along Elk Road addresses many of the concerns about traffic flow, walkability, and connections.
    - While this is recommended by the CFA Plan, after the CFA Plan was adopted, the LDC was also amended to require connections to adjacent properties. While more connections are encouraged, the provision of this connection has limited value as a public benefit when evaluating the zone change as it is a standard requirement of the LDC.
  - While the applicant has added more amenities to their designated "community spaces", these areas are more sitting areas than space for community connections, as was envisioned during the CFA planning process.
  - No additional information regarding employment numbers have been provided in order to allow for a more thorough evaluation of the housing component of the project.
    - As the project is incorporating 1 acre of land that is already zoned for multifamily, 12 of the 40 units are required and would not be seen as a public benefit. The applicant has proposed no restrictions for those units other than the requirement that they be long-term rentals.
    - The 28 additional units meet the recommendation of the DIGAH (Development Incentives and Guidelines for Affordable Housing) for affordable housing to be provided at a minimum rate of 12% of the number of guest rooms and the Letter of Intent indicates that the applicant intends to include a requirement for long term rental and an affordability restriction (restricted to those making 80% of AMI).
    - The LOI states 20-30 full time employees are anticipated. Staff has provided comments multiple times asking for more information on employment, including the number of part time employees, which has not been provided. Without this information, it cannot be determined if the project as a whole will be a net benefit or net negative to the housing situation in Sedona.
    - The applicant has not discussed any of the proposed housing or potential restrictions with the City's Housing Manager, so the Housing Department has been unable to provide any evaluation of the project.
  - Regarding the CFA's recommendation for mixed use development, but not additional lodging uses: While mixed use is not specifically defined in the CFA Plan, the LDC has 3 different mixed use zones – M1 (Mixed-Use Neighborhood), M2 (Mixed-Use Office), and M3 (Mixed-Use Activity Center) – which may be used as references for what the CFA Plan intends when it speaks of "Mixed Use Development". M3 is the only mixed use zone that allows lodging uses – Medium Density lodging is permitted, which is a maximum of 8 units per acre. On this site, that would allow for a maximum of 50 lodging units. The applicant's original application for this property was for rezoning to M3, which they chose to change

to Lodging when Staff informed them that the M3 zoning district would limit them to 8 lodging units per acre. The parcel already zoned as multifamily, remains multifamily.

- The applicant has provided an expanded explanation of their green business practices in the LOI. These commitments would need to be included in a potential Development Agreement.
- The buildings have been modified to mostly conform with the LDC. As outlined in the LDC checklist, there are some minor areas of non-compliance that could be worked out through the building permit process if the project were approved.
- The applicant has provided additional detail in the parking analysis. Many of the assumptions are dependent on the hotel, restaurant, bar, and meeting facility operating a way that would allow them to share parking. These commitments would need to be included in a potential Development Agreement.
- Additional bicycle parking has been added to the plans.

### **Page 15-16: Conclusion (Zone Change Evaluation)**

The decision of whether to approve a particular zone change is a legislative policy action left to the judgment and discretion of the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council. A variety of factors are considered when making these decisions, including how the proposal relates to the community's vision and overall consistency with the Sedona Community Plan and other applicable plans. The Planning and Zoning Commission is being asked to evaluate the proposal and forward a recommendation to the City Council.

While no project is expected to meet all of the recommendations and visions of the Community Plan, the applicable CFA Plan, and other adopted plans, zone change applications are expected to move the City closer to realizing this vision and projects should not detract from any of the visions. While the project as proposed is consistent with some of these recommendations, it falls short in other areas. The evaluation above, when seen as a supplement to the evaluation provided for the November 7, 2023 meeting, outlines the projects consistency/non-consistency in detail. To summarize:

- The CFA Plan for the area, along with the Community Plan and other adopted plans, and the Land Development Code, emphasizes improvements to the circulation network, including vehicular, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit connections. While the latest submittal provides the required connections, the value as a public benefit is mitigated based on the LDC requirement for connections (any project developing on this property would be required to provide connections).
- The applicant has included 40 housing units, with 28 deed restricted for affordability, but has not provided sufficient information or details to allow for a determination if this housing will meet the increased demand created by the project. In addition, the applicant has not discussed the housing component or the affordability restrictions with the City's Housing Manager.
- The CFA Plan recommends Mixed Use Development but does not support additional lodging uses. The only mixed use zone that would permit lodging (M3) would limit the total number of lodging units to 8 units per acre, for a total of 50 units. 110 lodging units are proposed.
- Many of the areas where the project has been found to be consistent are a result of complying with LDC requirements and not necessarily an area where the project exceeds the minimum expectations of the LDC or is providing a community benefit.

**Page 16-19: Approval Criteria Applicable to All Applications (ZC & DEV)**

These updates only address the approval criteria that Staff did not were satisfied in the previous review. Nothing has changed in the project that would cause any of the criteria that were previously met to not be met with the revised submittal.

- Finding C: Consistency with Sedona Community Plan and Other Applicable Plans
  - As outlined in the CFA Checklist and the evaluation above, there are still a number of areas where the project is not consistent with the Community Plan and other adopted plans. Even with the recent changes to the plans, Staff still does not believe this criterion is met.
  - The LDC allows the decision-making authority to weigh competing plan goals, policies, and strategies and allows the decision-making authority to approve an application that provides a public benefit even if the development is contrary to some of the goal, policies, or strategies in the Sedona Community Plan or other applicable plans.
  - If, in the Commission's review, they find that the public benefits offered by this application outweigh the inconsistency with the adopted plans, the Commission may find that this finding is satisfied.
- Finding D: Compliance with This Code [LDC] and Other Applicable Regulations
  - As outlined in the LDC Checklist, the updated proposal, while still non-compliant in some areas, is closer to compliance with the LDC and the areas of non-compliance may be addressed through conditions of approval that would be verified prior to building permits being issued. If the Commission finds that the proposal satisfies Finding C (above), it may also find that the proposal satisfies this finding, as conditioned. If the Commission finds that the proposal does not satisfy Finding C, this finding would not be satisfied, as the proposed use of the property would not be in compliance with the code.
- Finding E: Minimizes Impacts on Adjoining Property Owners
  - While addressing the LDC compliance issues of the previous proposal helps to minimize the impact of the buildings on the adjoining property owners, the applicant has not provided any updates on their Citizen Outreach Process, so it appears that additional public outreach has not been done. While the applicant submitted letters of support for the last hearing, many of these letters came from business owners, employees of neighboring businesses, or residents of other areas of Sedona. While the applicant makes some attempts to distance the proposed lodging uses from the existing residential, the applicant has not attempted to show how a rezone of the property to Lodging minimizes the impacts on the neighboring residents.
  - Since the original public hearing, Staff has received 4 additional public comments on the project. All 4 are from residents of the Saddlerock Subdivision and are against the project (New public comments are included as Attachment 4. For all public comments received on this project, please see the materials provided to the Commission for the November 7, 2023, public hearing.)
  - The public comments from the adjoining property owners were generally against the project, with concerns regarding the use of the site and the impacts the use would have. The statement in the original evaluation holds true:

- “the overarching theme for many of these comments was questioning the appropriateness of a hotel in this location. In amending the CFA Plan to remove the recommendation for additional lodging uses in this area, City Council has indicated that they agree with the residents that a hotel at this location is likely not an appropriate use.”
  - Therefore, Staff’s conclusion is that, as currently proposed, the project does not minimize impacts on adjoining property owners and this criterion is not met.
- Finding G: Minimize Adverse Environmental Impacts
  - The resubmitted application includes additional detail about the sustainability initiatives of the hotel. As many of these are related to operational aspects of the hotel, they would need to be included in a Development Agreement. If this is done, this criterion may be met.
- Finding I: Compliance with Utility, Service, and Improvement Standards
  - The original review found that this criterion was not met due to the number of sewer connections (Public Works has requested that the total number of sewer connections be reduced to address flow and odor issues identified in the area) and the lack of a commitment by the applicant to provide an easement for an underground odor control bio filter along Saddlerock Circle. If compliance with these items are added as conditions of approval, this criterion would be met.
- Finding J: Provide Adequate Road Systems
  - The provision of the required cross access points as easements allows the project to meet this criterion, as conditioned.

---

### Staff Recommendation and Motion

While the current submittal addresses many of the issues that caused Staff to recommend denial of the project at the November 7, 2023, public hearing, some of the more significant, overarching, issues remain unaddressed, including the following:

- Proposal of a 110 room hotel where the CFA plan recommends mixed use development. No mixed use zoning district would permit more than 50 lodging units.
- Lack of clarity regarding the proposed housing and whether it would be a net positive or negative to the City, as the applicant has not provided the requested information regarding employment numbers.
- Lack of a significant public benefit beyond the minimum requirements of the code, as many of the items being claimed as a public benefit (such as the road connections and sidewalks) are code requirements.
- No explanation as to how the proposed lodging zoning and this project minimizes the impacts on the neighboring residential properties.

Therefore, Staff is recommending denial of the Zone Change and Development Review based on the following:

1. As outlined in the staff report, staff evaluation, and this supplemental memo, the proposal is not in compliance with applicable goals and policies of the Community Plan.
2. As outlined in the staff report, staff evaluation, and this supplemental memo, the proposal is in partial compliance with applicable goals and policies of the Soldiers Pass CFA Plan.
3. As outlined in the staff report, staff evaluation, and this supplemental memo, the proposal is not in compliance with applicable goals and policies of other adopted plans, including the Transportation Master Plan, the GO! Sedona Pathways Plan, and the Climate Action Plan.
4. The proposal directly contradicts multiple goals and policies in the above-mentioned plans.
5. The proposal does not comply with applicable review criteria as outlined in the Staff Report, including it does minimize the impact on the adjoining property owners.

While Staff is still recommending denial of this project, it is understood that the Commission does not have to agree with Staff's evaluation. If the Commission believes that the findings are met, they should state how they believe the findings above are met (where Staff has concluded that the findings are not met). If this is the direction the Commission wishes to go, Staff has prepared proposed conditions of approval that should be part of the approval/recommendation of approval. (Attachment 3)

***Sample Motion for Commission Use***

(Please note that the below motion is offered as a sample only and that the Commission may make other motions as appropriate.)

**Recommended Motion for Denial (ZC):**

I move to recommend to the Sedona City Council denial of the proposed zoning request as set forth in case number PZ19-00005 (ZC), Village at Saddlerock Crossing, based on lack of compliance with ordinance requirements, inconsistency with the Sedona Community Plan, Soldiers Pass CFA Plan, Transportation Master Plan, GO! Sedona Pathways Plan, Climate Action Plan, the Land Development Code, and the requirements for approval, as specified in LDC Sections 8.3 and 8.6, and failure to satisfy the Zone Change findings and applicable Land Development Code requirements as outlined in the staff report and accompanying exhibits, which staff report and exhibits are hereby adopted as the findings of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

**Alternative Motion for Approval (ZC)**

I move to recommend to the Sedona City Council approval of case number PZ19-00005 (ZC), Village at Saddlerock Crossing, based on the following findings (please specify findings) and subject to the conditions of approval as proposed by Staff in the supplemental memo to the Staff Report.

---

***Recommended Motion for Denial (DEV)***

I move for denial of case number PZ19-00005 (DEV), Village at Saddlerock Crossing, because current zoning does not support the project and based on lack of compliance with all ordinance requirements of LDC Sections 8.3 and 8.4 and failure to satisfy the Development Review findings and applicable Land Development Code requirements as outlined in the staff report and accompanying exhibits, which staff report and exhibits are hereby adopted as the findings of the Planning and Zoning Commission, and the attached conditions of approval.

**Alternative Motion for Approval (DEV)**

I move for approval of case number PZ19-00005 (DEV), Village at Saddlerock Crossing, based on the following findings (specify findings). and subject to the conditions of approval as proposed by Staff in the supplemental memo to the Staff Report.

---

**Alternative Motion for Continuance (ZC, DEV)**

*I move for continuance of the public hearing for case number PZ19-00005 (ZC, DEV), Village at Saddlerock Crossing, to the Planning and Zoning Commission public hearing on (please specify date)*

---

**Attachments:**

1. Community Focus Area Checklist (Continuance).....	9
2. Land Development Code Checklist (Continuance) .....	18
3. Proposed Conditions of Approval (Should the Commission choose to approve the project).....	36
4. Additional Public Comments .....	41



# Soldiers Pass CFA Checklist

PZ19-00005 (ZC, DEV) The Village at Saddlerock Crossing



**City Of Sedona**  
**Community Development Department**  
 102 Roadrunner Drive Sedona, AZ 86336  
 (928) 282-1154 • [www.sedonaaz.gov/cd](http://www.sedonaaz.gov/cd)

The Sedona Community Plan provides the overarching vision for future development of the City and as an addendum the Community Focus Area (CFA) Plan provides a more specific vision for this area. Both are important tools in the City’s development review process which looks at new construction projects, such as commercial, lodging, or housing as well as renovations and redevelopment. The CFA Plan will be used by City staff, the City’s Planning and Zoning Commission, and City Council when reviewing and evaluating proposed projects. The CFA Plan is also a tool for use by property owners, developers, and residents preparing a development proposal. The plan is intended to serve as a guide when preparing a development proposal by establishing the community’s expectations for future development of this area.

--Community Focus Area Plan for the Soldiers Pass Road CFA, page 25, Implementation

**Public Hearing Date:** November 7, 2023

*February 6, 2023 (Continuance)*

*For sections where the evaluation changed based on the resubmittal, an update is provided in red italics. If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the project, potential conditions of approval to address the areas that are still out of compliance are included below the “Compliance” box, denoted by a purple box to the left of the recommended condition of approval.*

The Sedona Land Development Code (LDC) Section 8.3.E(5)c states: *the proposed development shall be consistent with and conform to the Sedona Community Plan, Community Focus Area plans, and any other applicable plans. The decision-making authority:*

1. *Shall weigh competing plan goals, policies, and strategies; and*
2. *May approve an application that provides a public benefit even if the development is contrary to some of the goals, policies, or strategies in the Sedona Community Plan or other applicable plans.*

The following is staff’s evaluation of the project for compliance with the Soldiers Pass CFA Plan.

**Reviewer:** Cari Meyer, Planning Manager

Color Coding	Full Compliance	Partial Compliance	Non-Compliance	Not Applicable
--------------	-----------------	--------------------	----------------	----------------

<b>Planning Area Boundary (Page 4)</b>	
	<i>Evaluation:</i> The entirety of the project site is within the CFA Planning Area Boundary.
	<i>Compliance:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
<b>Future Land Use Map (Page 5)</b>	
	<i>Evaluation:</i> The project site is designated Commercial and Multi-Family Medium/High Density on the Future Land Use Map (Note: This map is from the Community Plan and is included in the CFA plan for reference purposes only).
<b>Compatible Land Uses (Page 10)</b>	
CFA Objective: A complete neighborhood center that is a mix of complementary and compatible land uses.	
	Strategy 1: New development should complement and coordinate with adjacent properties
	<i>Evaluation:</i> The site is bordered on the north and west by public roads (Saddlerock Circle and W State Route 89A). The project provides a new connector road from Saddlerock to 89A, allowing the development and the Saddlerock neighborhood to connect to 89A at a signalized intersection, as well as a widened sidewalk along W State Route 89A and sidewalks along all existing and proposed roads. Sidewalks would also extend south on Saddlerock Circle to Valley View (about 200 feet south of project site).

	<p>To the east of the project site is Elk Road (private road) and a mix of other uses, including the Elks Lodge, a salon, shops, offices, and Cook’s Cemetery. This development does not provide a vehicular connection to the properties to the east and the pedestrian connection provided is a 3’ wide granite pathway off of the back side of the parking garage, which does not meet the minimum sidewalk/walkway requirements of the Land Development Code or the more robust interconnected development expectations of the CFA plan.</p> <p>Improving the walkability of the area enables residents of the multifamily housing and the guests of the hotel to leave their cars and provides them with access to local businesses and transit. This could increase the customer base for commercial businesses in the area, and new connections increase the walkability of the area as a whole.</p> <p><i>The plans have been amended to include a connection to Elk Road from the parking structure and the 3’ gravel path along Elk Road has been changed to a 5’ concrete sidewalk.</i></p>
	<p>Compliance: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Compliance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Strategy 2: Mitigate the impacts of commercial land uses on neighboring residents using a variety of methods such as building design, site layout, and landscaping.</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> The “Multifamily South” building is the closest building to existing residential neighborhoods and is the shortest building relative to natural grade (no alternate standards needed).</p> <p>The lodging building closest to the existing neighborhood is the “Treehouse Suites” building, which is the tallest building on the site relative to natural grade (applying maximum alternate standards and the height exception for sloped roofs). It is separated from the existing residences by approximately 50 feet, which includes a sidewalk, road, and landscaping. Other lodging buildings are at least 115 feet from the existing residences and separated by a sidewalk, road, parking lot, and landscaping.</p> <p>Other commercial land uses, including the parking garage, restaurant/rooftop bar, and hotel pool area, are located on the interior of the site and screened by the proposed buildings.</p> <p><i>No changes to the site/building layouts are proposed with this submittal.</i></p>
	<p>Compliance: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Strategy 3: Coordinated development is encouraged to enable shared access, parking, and community spaces.</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> The layout of the site allows the uses proposed within this site to share access and parking and provides an opportunity for the properties to the south to have access to the light via the new connector road. However, the recommendations of the CFA plan would also include coordinated development with the properties to the east, allowing for cross access between those uses and giving those properties access to the light as well. Coordinated development/shared access with the properties to the east is not provided for as a part of this development plan.</p> <p><i>The plans have been amended to include a connection to Elk Road from the parking structure and the 3’ gravel path along Elk Road has been changed to a 5’ concrete sidewalk..</i></p> <p>There are no shared community spaces.</p> <p><i>The proposed community spaces have been identified as the bus stop and the area between the parking garage and the connector road. While the applicant is proposing to include benches and bike racks, they will primarily provide a place for people to sit and are not community spaces as envisioned by the CFA.</i></p>
	<p>Compliance: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Strategy 4: Create a dynamic area that is not dominated by a single use, but is a balanced mix of land uses that includes housing, lodging, and commercial.</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> While the CFA as a whole has a wide variety of land uses, multifamily residential (apartments) is underrepresented. The Vista Montana townhomes are on the north side of the CFA and there is a significant amount of single family residential to the north and south of the CFA. Providing residential uses in proximity to the existing uses can contribute to a more dynamic, walkable area. Lodging uses can also take advantage</p>

	<p>of being located in a more walkable area, offering their guests the ability to leave their car at the hotel while walking to nearby restaurants and shops.</p> <p><b>Compliance:</b>   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b>       <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partial</b>       <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>       <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Not Applicable</b></p>
	<p><b>Mixed Use Development Standards (Page 11)</b></p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> Page 11 of the CFA plan outlines the mixed-use development standards that projects within this CFA are expected to meet. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Mixed Use Development: Integrating multiple uses into one coordinated development project with an emphasis on residential needs and uses can reduce the need to drive, and thus not contribute further to traffic congestion. No additional lodging uses are recommended in this CFA.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This project includes 110 lodging units and 40 residential units.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>No change to the proposed uses. The CFA Plan recommends mixed use, with an emphasis on residential needs. While mixed use is not specifically defined in the CFA Plan, the LDC has 3 different mixed use zones – M1 (Mixed-Use Neighborhood), M2 (Mixed-Use Office), and M3 (Mixed-Use Activity Center) – which may be used as references for what the CFA Plan is intending when it speaks of “Mixed Use Development”. M3 is the only mixed use zone that allows lodging uses – Medium Density lodging is permitted, which is a maximum of 8 units per acre. On this site, that would allow for a maximum of 50 units. The applicant’s original application for this property was for rezoning to M3, which they chose to change to Lodging when Staff informed them that the M3 zoning district would limit them to 8 lodging units per acre.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Shared Community Space: Common areas shall be incorporated into the project design that will serve as gathering spaces for visitors, and local residents. Examples: lounge, atrium, plaza, garden, or courtyard with ample seating.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The common areas in this project are provided as a part of another site element, such as the restaurant, bar, or conference center. The only outdoor area with seating is the bus stop.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>The proposed community spaces have been identified as the bus stop and the area between the parking garage and the new connector road. While the applicant is proposing to include benches and bike racks in these areas, they will primarily provide a place for people to sit and are not community spaces as was envisioned by the CFA.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Housing: If the mixed use project involves property zoned as residential, the equivalent number of maximum units allowed under the current zoning must be included within the development project. The housing shall be multi-family, such as apartments, condominiums, townhomes, or employee housing.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The project includes 1 acre that is currently zoned as RM-2 (12 units per acre). 40 multifamily units are proposed. (The project complies with this criterion.)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>Site Layout: Buildings adjacent to SR 89A shall be aligned perpendicular or at an angle to SR 89A (not parallel to SR 89A.); Multiple buildings are preferred to one larger building; Parking is to be located behind the buildings, and not facing SR 89A or visible from a public street or SR 89A.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The buildings and parking layout are in compliance with these criteria.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>Connectivity: Sidewalks and paths shall link on-site amenities, parking, building entrances, trails, streets, community spaces, and adjacent destinations; Projects shall be designed to maximize connectivity for vehicles to improve safety and minimize local traffic congestion, such as creating new street connections, and connected and shared driveways and parking lots.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ While the project provides a connection to the light for residents to the south, it has not been designed to incorporate connectivity to the properties to the east. Based on the project’s layout (buildings and a parking garage along the eastern property line), that connectivity, which is recommended by the CFA plan, cannot happen with the current plan.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p><i>The plans have been amended to include a connection to Elk Road from the parking structure and the 3' gravel path along Elk Road has been changed to a 5' concrete sidewalk.</i></p> <p>Compliance: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Housing Diversity (Page 13)</b> CFA Objective: A range of housing options that vary by type, size, and price ranges that offer an alternative to single-family housing.</p>	
	<p>Strategy 1: Increase the amount of multi-family residential housing within the CFA.</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> The proposal includes 40 housing units. The plans show a mix of 2-bedroom, 1-bedroom, and studio units, but the plans are not consistent as to the number of each type of unit proposed.</p> <p>The LOI states that the development will employ 20-30 full time employees. The LOI does not provide any information about part-time employees, which has been requested by Staff. If part-time employees make up a significant percentage of hotel employees, the housing impact from the project would be greater than the 20-30 full-time employees. While the amount of multi-family residential housing within the CFA would be increased with this project, it could be offset by the number of employees needing housing.</p> <p><i>The resubmittal did not provide any additional information regarding employment numbers or part-time employees that would allow further review of the impact of the proposed housing being provided vs. the amount of new housing demand being created.</i></p> <p>Compliance: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Strategy 2: Commercial development projects should incorporate housing, such as workforce, affordable, and multi-family housing.</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> The project includes 40 housing units. 12 of those units are required based on the project incorporating approximately one acre of land currently zoned RM-2 (12 units per acre).</p> <p>The LOI states that all units will be restricted for long-term rental and 28 units will be available to individuals earning up to 80% of AMI, with the units marketed to on-site employees first. The restricted units would be 24 studios and 4 one-bedrooms, leaving 4 one-bedrooms and 8 two-bedrooms as market rate units. It appears that the restricted units would be located in the “multifamily north” section of the project (closest to 89A) while the market rate units would be in the “multifamily south” section (furthest from 89A). Ideally, the restricted units would be spread evenly throughout the development and across unit types.</p> <p>If the project moves forwards, the applicant will need to work with the City’s Housing Department to discuss the specifics of what a development agreement for these restrictions would entail.</p> <p>Compliance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Strategy 3: The diversity of housing types should increase with more multi-family residential options that accommodate seniors, singles, and others who want alternatives to a detached single-family house.</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> The project plans are inconsistent with the mix of unit types proposed – the coversheet for the plans states ten 2-bedroom units, twenty 1-bedroom units, and ten studios while the floorplans show eight 2-bedroom units, eight 1-bedroom units, and 24 studios. (The statements in the LOI appear to match what is shown on the floorplans.) While the unit mix would need to be clarified, the project would provide a diversity of housing types and an alternative to single-family houses.</p> <p><i>The plans now state the development will have 24 studios, six 1-bedroom units, and 10 two-bedroom units.</i></p> <p>Compliance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Traffic Flow and Connectivity (Page 14)</b> CFA Objective: Improved safety and reduced traffic congestion on SR 89A.</p>	
	<p>Strategy 1: Safety and traffic congestion on 89A and intersecting streets should be addressed with appropriate street improvements, such as enhanced crosswalks, medians, or roundabouts.</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> Saddlerock Circle would be converted to a right in/right out intersection, eliminating left hand turns in and out of this intersection, reducing turning conflicts with the entrance to the Whole Foods center across 89A. (Vehicles will have the option of using the new connector road for left turns.)</p>

	<p>No other street improvements recommended by the CFA plan are proposed.</p> <p><i>The plans have been updated to include enhanced crosswalks at the W State Route 89A/Soldiers Pass intersection, subject to ADOT approval.</i></p>
	<p>Compliance: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Compliance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Strategy 2: Improve access between businesses and neighborhoods and reduce conflicts on 89A by connecting, consolidating, and sharing driveways and parking lots.</p>
	<p><i>Evaluation:</i> The entire development will use a single access on 89A with a secondary access point on Saddlerock Circle. As the current parcel layout includes at least six parcels with street frontage. Limiting access to two access points is an improvement over the current conditions. The development shares parking facilities. However, as mentioned previously, no access to the properties to the east is proposed and none is possible given the current layout of the site.</p> <p><i>The plans have been amended to include a connection to Elk Road from the parking structure and the sidewalk along Elk Road has been upgraded to a 5' wide concrete sidewalk.</i></p>
	<p>Compliance: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Compliance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Strategy 3: Street connections should be created, such as a connection from Saddlerock Circle to the signal on 89A at Soldiers Pass Road.</p>
	<p><i>Evaluation:</i> This development creates the connection from Saddlerock Circle to the signal on 89A at Soldiers Pass Road.</p>
	<p>Compliance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Walking and Biking Improvements (Page 15)</b></p>	
<p>CFA Objective: Improved safety, convenience, and experience for walking and bicycling</p>	
	<p>Strategy 1: Continuous streetscapes along 89A should be created to provide a safer and more appealing place to walk.</p>
	<p><i>Evaluation:</i> The development would provide a 10' wide sidewalk along State Route 89A. The sidewalks would be separated from the street and go through a landscape area.</p>
	<p>Compliance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Strategy 2: Safer crossings of 89A should be provided with enhanced crosswalks, medians, and/or roundabouts.</p>
	<p><i>Evaluation:</i> No changes to 89A are proposed as a part of this project.</p> <p><i>The plans have been updated to include enhanced crosswalks at the W State Route 89A/Soldiers Pass intersection, subject to ADOT approval.</i></p>
	<p>Compliance: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Compliance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Strategy 3: Safety and amenities for bicyclists, such as bike racks and pavement markings should be improved to encourage bicycling.</p>
	<p><i>Evaluation:</i> The 10' wide sidewalks will allow for bicycles. It is not clear whether the new connector road will have a bike lane. Bicycle parking is provided in compliance with code requirements, but no additional bicycle parking or bicycle amenities are shown.</p> <p><i>It is still not clear whether the new connector road will have a bike lane. Additional bicycle parking has been provided along with indoor bicycle storage for hotel guests.</i></p>
	<p>Compliance: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Strategy 4: Transit stops with bus pull-outs, benches, and shelters should be provided.</p>
	<p><i>Evaluation:</i> The plans show a stop for the Verde Lynx within the deceleration lane on 89A entering the site. A bench and waiting area are also provided.</p>
	<p>Compliance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>

	<p>Strategy 5: Route information (destinations, distances, and direction) at visible locations, such as intersections, transit stops, trailheads, and public spaces should be provided.</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> No information on how the project is addressing this strategy is provided. While implementation of this strategy would likely occur after the project is complete, the applicant has made no commitments at this stage of review.</p> <p><i>While the LOI now contains a commitment to installing wayfinding information, no information about what that would contain is provided.</i></p> <p><b>Compliance:</b>   <input type="checkbox"/> Yes       <input type="checkbox"/> Partial       <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No       <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p><b>Compliance:</b>   <input type="checkbox"/> Yes       <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partial       <input type="checkbox"/> No       <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p><i>If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the project, the following would be recommended conditions of approval:</i></p> <p><i>Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, staff shall verify that all construction is in substantial accordance with the plans as submitted, reviewed, and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission, and meets the following conditions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Wayfinding signs shall be installed in the locations described in the Letter of Intent. Information on the wayfinding signs shall be coordinated with and approved by City Staff prior to installation.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Neighborhood Connections (Page 17)</b>                  A connected network of sidewalks and trails that link neighborhoods and lodging to businesses and destinations such as parks, National Forest trails, and the West Sedona School.</p>	
	<p>Strategy 1: Connected paths that allow for direct pedestrian and bicycle access should be provided within and between housing and commercial developments.</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> The development proposes sidewalks and shared use paths along all existing and proposed streets (with the exception of Elk Road). Sidewalks and shared use paths are provided into the development, connecting the housing and commercial uses to the sidewalk/shared use path network.</p> <p><i>The plans have been amended to include a connection to Elk Road from the parking structure and the 3' gravel path along Elk Road has been changed to a 5' concrete sidewalk.</i></p> <p><b>Compliance:</b>   <input type="checkbox"/> Yes       <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partial       <input type="checkbox"/> No       <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p><b>Compliance:</b>   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes       <input type="checkbox"/> Partial       <input type="checkbox"/> No       <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Strategy 2: Pedestrian access to public sidewalks and adjacent transit stops should be incorporated into development projects.</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> Pedestrian access from the lodging and housing uses is provided, which also connects to the transit stop.</p> <p><b>Compliance:</b>   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes       <input type="checkbox"/> Partial       <input type="checkbox"/> No       <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Strategy 3: Sidewalks should be extended along streets such as Airport Road, Saddlerock Circle, and Soldiers Pass Road.</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> The development will install a sidewalk along Saddlerock Circle, including the street frontage of the project and continuing south to the intersection of Saddlerock and Valley View Drive (approximately 200 feet south of the project site).</p> <p><b>Compliance:</b>   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes       <input type="checkbox"/> Partial       <input type="checkbox"/> No       <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Strategy 4: Partnerships with landowners are encouraged to create a connected trail system that enables off-street pedestrian and bicycle travel.</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> The pedestrian and bicycle travel proposed with this development would be limited to the streets, off-street travel is not enabled with this plan. This could be accomplished by providing a more robust connection to the properties to the east. This connection was provided in earlier versions of the plans, but was removed in the more recent versions of the plans. Staff had provided comments to the applicant that this connection needed to be added back in and the applicant chose not to do so.</p>

	<p><i>The plans have been amended to include a connection to Elk Road from the parking structure and the 3' gravel path along Elk Road has been changed to a 5' concrete sidewalk.</i></p> <p>Compliance: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Compliance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Green Building (Page 18)</b>                  Conservation practices are incorporated into building and landscape design, construction, and maintenance</p>	
	<p>Strategy 1: The use of solar energy in building designs for energy, heating, and lighting is encouraged.</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> The project proposed solar panel on the upper level of the parking garage. The LOI states this will be able to power site's landscape lighting, landscape irrigation controls, rainwater harvesting pumps, and potentially parking structure lighting. No solar panels are proposed for the buildings and it does not appear that any of the buildings will use solar power.</p> <p><i>The applicant has committed to making the hotel buildings "solar ready," but has not committed to installing solar panels at this stage of the project.</i></p> <p>Compliance: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Strategy 2: Waste reduction measures should be integrated into building construction, maintenance, and business operations, including the utilization of recycled building materials</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> The applicant has not made a commitment to waste reduction measures in the construction process. The LOI lists "green hotel" measures that are used at other properties they own/manage and have stated they intend to implement the same measures for this property.</p> <p><i>The resubmittal includes an expanded list of "Green Hotel Measures." As many of these items would be implemented in the operation of the hotel, they would need to be included in the Development Agreement to ensure that the commitments are realized.</i></p> <p>Compliance: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p><i>If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the project, the following would be recommended conditions of approval:</i></p> <p><i>Prior to the issuance of grading and building permits, the applicant shall enter into a Development Agreement with the City of Sedona that covers, at a minimum, the following items:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Development and ongoing management of the property in compliance with the commitments made in the Letter of Intent, specifically the Sustainability/Green Building Section of the LOI.</i></li> </ul>
	<p>Strategy 3: Non-compliant outdoor lighting should be converted to dark-sky compliant and energy efficient lighting.</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> The property is currently vacant; no non-compliant outdoor lighting exists.</p> <p>Compliance: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Strategy 4: Xeriscape principles in landscaping should be practiced by conserving water and using appropriate plants reflective of Sedona's natural environment that contribute to a sense of place.</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> 58% of the plants proposed are native species and the plans state that 27 existing trees will be preserved. The balance of plants are adaptive to the Sedona area. The plans do not include an excessive number of plants (174 trees required, 185 proposed – 106% of requirement; 813 shrubs required, 816 proposed – 100.3 % of requirement). Use of native and adaptive species and not overplanting the site will reduce water use for landscaping once the landscaping is established on the property and ensure the site fits into Sedona's natural environment.</p> <p>Compliance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Strategy 5: Stormwater should be managed with "green infrastructure" practices that slow and capture runoff.</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> The applicant has proposed including rainwater harvesting tanks, which will help reduce the amount of runoff as well as water used for landscaping. Any water not captured by the rainwater tanks will be managed through the drainage system on the property, which will need to be approved by the City's Public</p>

	<p>Works Department prior to construction (a preliminary grading and drainage plan has been provided with this application).</p> <p><b>Compliance:</b>   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i>                      <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partial</i>                      <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i>                      <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Applicable</i></p>
<p><b>Sense of Place (Page 19)</b></p>	
<p>An identifiable area recognized for its natural features and the design quality of its built features.</p>	
	<p>Strategy 1: Scenic views, natural areas, and hillsides should be preserved by clustering development to preserve open space.</p>
	<p><i>Evaluation:</i> There are no natural areas or hillsides that need preserving on this property. While the buildings will likely block some of the scenic views from the properties to the south, the buildings would be required to meet the City’s height requirements and the applicant is not requesting any variances or waivers that are outside of code allowances. This site also sits at a lower elevation than the adjacent residences, limiting the impact the buildings will have on the views of the neighboring properties.</p> <p><b>**NOTE:</b> As outlined in Staff’s evaluation of the heights of the buildings, detailed in the LDC Checklist, the buildings as currently designed either do not meet height requirements or the information provided on the plans does not allow for a complete review for compliance with height requirements. If the project were to move forward, the applicant would need to ensure that all buildings meet height requirements.**</p> <p><b>Compliance:</b>   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i>                      <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partial</i>                      <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i>                      <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Applicable</i></p>
	<p>Strategy 2: Development design should be complementary to the architectural character of the surrounding area as well as the natural environment.</p>
	<p><i>Evaluation:</i> The design of the buildings is complementary to the design of the surrounding area. The buildings use dark, earthen colors, and natural materials to blend into the natural environment.</p> <p><b>Compliance:</b>   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i>                      <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partial</i>                      <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i>                      <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Applicable</i></p>
	<p>Strategy 3: The significance of the Cook’s Cemetery to Sedona’s history should be recognized by maintaining public access, improving the surroundings, and increasing awareness of this City Historic Landmark.</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> The LOI states that the applicant is working to improve access to the cemetery. This improved access is not shown on the plans. The cemetery is to the west of the project site and, as mentioned at other places in this review, the access/connections from this site to the properties to the east is lacking/does not meet the expectations of the CFA. A connection to the cemetery would also need to go through other private properties and the applicant has not specified if or how they are working with the other affected property owners to improve the connection.</p> <p>The LOI states that the applicant is working with a neighboring property owner to provide an 8-space parking lot for the cemetery and legal vehicular access. No plans for this parking lot or access have been submitted as a part of this project and it is unclear if this would be permitted, as many of the properties surrounding the cemetery are zoned residential and would not permit a parking lot.</p> <p><i>Staff has not received any confirmation from the Historic Society or neighboring property owners that these plans are in development. Staff has not received any additional information regarding the 8-space parking lot and still has concerns as to whether this would be a permitted use.</i></p> <p><b>Compliance:</b>   <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i>                      <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partial</i>                      <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i>                      <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Applicable</i></p>
	<p>Strategy 4: The reuse of historic buildings is encouraged to preserve the cultural history that contributes to a sense of place.</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> The property previously had buildings that had been surveyed as part of the City’s Historic Resource Survey (buildings were never landmarked). Staff comments on early iterations of the project included comments regarding reuse of the historic buildings, incorporating the building materials into the project site, or acknowledging the history of the site in another way. While the applicant has since demolished the surveyed structures, the LOI proposes a historic exhibit in the hotel lobby. No details of this exhibit have been provided.</p> <p><b>Compliance:</b>   <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i>                      <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Partial</i>                      <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i>                      <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Applicable</i></p>



<b>Sense of Community (Page 22)</b>	
A neighborhood center with appealing and accessible community spaces that reflect a sense of community.	
	<p>Strategy 1: Open, shared community spaces should be incorporated into development projects.</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> While open spaces are provided, they appear to be primarily for hotel guests or residents of the development. The one area that may be considered a community space is the area around the transit stop, which includes shade, a bench, a bike rack, and water station.</p> <p><i>The resubmittal added benches to the area between the parking structure and the connector road. These appear to be primarily a place to sit and not the community spaces envisioned by the CFA plan.</i></p> <p><b>Compliance:</b>    <input type="checkbox"/> Yes            <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partial            <input type="checkbox"/> No            <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Strategy 2: Community space amenities such as shade, seating, landscaping, and public art should be provided.</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> Amenities at the transit stop include shade, seating, and landscaping. The project’s public art is proposed to be installed further into the site near the parking structure.</p> <p><b>Compliance:</b>    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes            <input type="checkbox"/> Partial            <input type="checkbox"/> No            <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Strategy 3: Community spaces should be designed to mitigate noise and other potential impacts to neighbors.</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> The community space is on the north side of the project site, furthest from the adjacent residential neighborhood. The rooftop bar/restaurant could be viewed as additional community gathering space and is screened from the existing residential development by buildings.</p> <p><b>Compliance:</b>    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes            <input type="checkbox"/> Partial            <input type="checkbox"/> No            <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Strategy 4: The large, mature trees south of the Soldiers Pass Road/89A intersection should be incorporated into future development as community space.</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> The trees at the intersection are preserved and adjacent to the proposed community space.</p> <p><b>Compliance:</b>    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes            <input type="checkbox"/> Partial            <input type="checkbox"/> No            <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>

**Land Development Code Checklist**  
 PZ19-00005 (DEV) The Village at Saddlerock Crossing



**City Of Sedona**  
**Community Development Department**  
 102 Roadrunner Drive Sedona, AZ 86336  
 (928) 282-1154 • [www.sedonaz.gov/cd](http://www.sedonaz.gov/cd)

The Sedona Land Development Code sets the minimum criteria for review and approval of all new construction and renovation proposals by the City’s Community Development Department and Planning & Zoning Commission. Applicants of proposed development projects must demonstrate compliance with these development standards.

**Public Hearing Date:** November 7, 2023

*February 6, 2024 (Continuance)*

*Updated evaluations of each code section are provided in red italics. If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the project, potential conditions of approval to address the areas that are still out of compliance are included below the “Compliance” box, denoted by a purple box to the left of the recommended condition of approval.*

*\*This application is being reviewed in conjunction with a concurrent request to rezone the subject properties to L (Lodging) and is done based on the requirements for the Lodging zone. If the associated rezoning is not approved, this review would not be valid, as lodging would not be a permitted use for the property.*

**Reviewer:** Cari Meyer, Planning Manager

Color Coding	Full Compliance	Partial Compliance	Non-Compliance	Not Applicable
--------------	-----------------	--------------------	----------------	----------------

<b>LDC Article 2: Zoning Districts</b>	
2.16: L: Lodging	
2.16.B: L Lot and Building Standards	<p><i>Evaluation: <b>Lot Standards:</b> The lot meets the minimum lot width and area.</i></p> <p><b>Setbacks:</b> The project provides 15 foot setbacks along W SR 89A and Saddlerock Circle and 20 foot setbacks along the south property line (adjacent to residential). The 10 foot setback along Elk Road (east property line) is shown as measured to the edge of a roadway easement (not the property line), as required by LDC Section 2.24.D(1)a. However, the ALTA Survey shows an additional 20’ ingress/egress easement to the west of the roadway easement that is not included on the site plan. The setback needs to be measured from the edge of that easement and the site plan needs to be adjusted.</p> <p><i>While an updated ALTA Survey has not been provided, the applicant has verbally stated that the additional 20’ easement was abandoned. If the 20’ easement was abandoned, the 10’ setback from Elk Road must still be measured from the edge of the roadway easement (shown on the survey as 13.5’ from the property line). While the site plans are not clear, it appears that a corner of the eastern building of the “Multi-Family North” buildings encroaches into this setback as well as perhaps the wall of the parking garage (extent of parking garage wall is not clear).</i></p> <p><i>The front setback is shown on the plans at 10 feet, not the required 15 feet. Assuming the buildings have not moved since the previous review, the location should still be okay. The correct setback would need to be shown and the location of the buildings confirmed as compliant.</i></p> <p><b>Heights:</b> As outlined in the height evaluation (See LDC Section 2.24.E), multiple buildings either do not comply with height requirements or the information provided is not sufficient to make that determination.</p> <p><i>While the revised plans are closer to compliance than the previous submittal, there are still some areas that need to be addressed, with most of the outstanding items being clarifications where the plans are unclear. If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the project, Staff has included recommended Conditions of Approval to ensure that these areas are addressed when the project is submitted for building permits.</i></p>

	<p><b>Impervious Coverage:</b> The project plans state the project has a building coverage of 23.2% (60% permitted) and a total coverage of 62.5% (80% permitted). However, based on the calculations provided, it is not clear where the parking structure/parking lots are factored into these calculations.</p> <p><i>It is still not clear where the parking structure is factored into these calculations.</i></p> <p>Compliance: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p><i>If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the project, the following would be a recommended condition of approval:</i></p> <p><i>The plans submitted for building permits shall comply with all applicable Land Development Code requirements and incorporate the following changes from the plans reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Site plan shall be coordinated with the most up-to-date survey and all structures shall meet all required setbacks, measured from the ROW line or the roadway easement.</i></li> <li><i>• Plans shall include a detailed breakdown of building and lot coverage, showing a maximum of 60% building coverage and 80% lot coverage, and ensuring all site elements are accounted for.</i></li> </ul>
<p>2.16.C: Other Standards</p>	<p><i>Evaluation:</i> The project complies with some code requirements, does not comply with others, or the application does not contain sufficient information to determine compliance. These areas are outlined in detail in the remainder of this checklist.</p> <p><i>Updated evaluations of each code section are provided in red italics. If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the project, potential conditions of approval to address the areas that are still out of compliance are included below the "Compliance" box, denoted by a purple box to the left of the recommended condition of approval.</i></p> <p>Compliance: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
<p>2.24: Measurements and Exceptions</p>	
<p>2.24.B: Density</p>	<p><i>Evaluation:</i> 40 long-term rental units are proposed on approximately 6.15 acres. As the units would include restrictions for both long-term rentals and affordability, there is no cap on density in the Lodging district.</p> <p>Compliance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
<p>2.24.C: Lot and Space Requirements</p>	<p><i>Evaluation:</i> The lot meets minimum dimension requirements. All buildings are reviewed for the same setback and height requirements.</p> <p>Compliance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
<p>2.24.D: Setbacks</p>	<p><i>Evaluation:</i> The project provides 15 foot setbacks along W SR 89A and Saddlerock Circle and 20 foot setbacks along the south property line (adjacent to residential). The 10 foot setback along Elk Road (east property line) is measured to the edge of a roadway easement (not the property line), as required by LDC Section 2.24.D(1)a. However, the ALTA Survey shows an additional 20' ingress/egress easement to the west of the roadway easement that is not included on the site plan. The applicant has not clarified the status of this easement. If the easement is valid, the setback would be measured to the edge of the easement and the site plan would need to be adjusted.</p> <p>No exceptions to setback requirements are requested.</p> <p><i>While an updated ALTA Survey has not been provided, the applicant has verbally stated that the additional 20' easement was abandoned. If the 20' easement was abandoned, the 10 foot setback from Elk Road must still be measured from the edge of the roadway easement (shown on the survey as 13.5' from the property line). While the site plans are not clear, it appears that a corner of the eastern building of the "Multi-Family</i></p>

	<p><i>North” buildings encroaches into this setback as well as perhaps the wall of the parking garage (extent of parking garage wall is not clear.</i></p> <p><b>Compliance:</b>   <input type="checkbox"/> Yes        <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Partial</i>        <input type="checkbox"/> No        <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p> <p><i>If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the project, the following would be a recommended condition of approval:</i></p> <p><i>The plans submitted for building permits shall comply with all applicable Land Development Code requirements and incorporate the following changes from the plans reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Site plan shall be coordinated with the most up-to-date survey and all structures shall meet all required setbacks, measured from the ROW line or the roadway easement.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>2.24.E: Building Height</b></p>	<p><i>Evaluation:</i> Commercial height standards were used in review of this project. All buildings (except for the multifamily south buildings) require alternate standards. The paint colors get 5 points (2.5 feet). Buildings that require more than 5 points would need to get the remainder of the points using unrelieved building planes. In the project plans, alternate standards have not been calculated correctly for any of the buildings, and Staff has not been able to make a determination of compliance for any of the buildings.</p> <p>Unrelieved building planes are defined as: <i>Any vertical surface, or the projection to a vertical plane of an inclined or curved surface, or wall of a structure that, when viewed in elevation, incorporates no overhangs, offsets, projections, decks, ramadas, loggias, or similar architectural features that would produce shadow patterns or otherwise serve to visually blend the structure into its natural background. Windows and doors do not in themselves provide relief, but if they project or recede a minimum of 12 inches they may be considered as providing visual relief.</i></p> <p>The applicant has shown building planes being reduced in ways that are not compliant, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change of building materials. A change of building materials is permitted to reduce the maximum building plane permitted under LDC Section 5.7.F(2)c.3, but not when being used to increase height (LDC Section 2.24.E)</li> <li>• Building planes not visible from the public ROW. This is permitted when addressing the maximum building planes permitted under LDC Section 5.7.F(2)c.3, but not when being used to increase height (LDC Section 2.24.E)</li> <li>• Removal of windows and doors from the calculation of unrelieved building plane. The plans do not indicate that any of the windows or doors are recessed by a minimum of 12 inches, as required by the definition in order to be removed from the calculation.</li> </ul> <p><i>Buildings have been redesigned to incorporate recession and projections to address unrelieved building plane requirements (reliance on change in building materials has been removed). Notes have been added to the plans where windows and doors are proposed to be recessed. While the plans do not indicate the amount of recession of the windows, a minimum of 12 inches would be required.</i></p> <p>Height evaluations for each building are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lobby/Restaurant Building: 10 points required             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The largest unrelieved building plane is limited to 400 sf. The plans show the largest unrelieved building plane at over 800 sf. Reductions using building materials are not applicable for this requirement. Other building planes are calculated at less than 400 sf, but do not include windows. Once windows are included, it appears that multiple building planes will exceed 400 sf.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>The building plane that exceeded 800 square feet on the previous plans has been divided into 3 separate building planes, each no more than 400 square feet, and a note has been added to the plans that the windows will be recessed. (Sheet A-19) The plans do not specify the amount of recession, but a minimum of 1’ would be</i></p>

*required. While Sheet A-19 shows compliance, the plan set still includes Sheet A-18, which shows the building as proposed under the previous submittal (found to be non-compliant).*

- Treehouse Suites Building: 10 points required
  - The largest unrelieved building plane is limited to 400 sf. The plans show the largest unrelieved building plane at over 800 sf. Reductions using building materials are not applicable for this requirement. Other building planes are calculated at less than 400 sf, but do not include windows or doors. Once windows and doors are included, it appears that the building planes will exceed 400 sf.

*Most of the unrelieved building planes that exceeded 400 square feet before have been reduced. It is unclear from the elevations if there is sufficient projections/recessions between a few of the building planes to allow them to count separately. Based on the floor plans, it appears there may be a mistake on the elevations, but that would need to be confirmed at building permit review. A note has been added to the plans that some of the windows will be recessed. (Sheet A-26) The plans do not specify the amount of recession, but a minimum of 1' would be required.*

- West Wing and North Wing: 10 points
  - The largest unrelieved building plane is limited to 400 sf. Building planes are calculated by at less than 400 sf, but do not include windows. Once windows are included, it appears that the building planes will exceed 400 sf.

*The unrelieved building planes that exceeded 400 square feet have been redesigned to be under 400 square feet. No windows are being removed from these calculations.*

- East Wing: 9 points
  - The largest unrelieved building plane is limited to 450 sf. Building planes are calculated at less than 450 sf, but do not include windows. Once windows are included, it appears that the building planes will exceed 450 sf

*The unrelieved building planes that exceeded 450 square feet have been redesigned to be under 450 square feet. No windows are being removed from these calculations.*

- Multi-family North: Building exceeds maximum permitted height
  - The roof height schedule includes all ridges and eaves, but not the heights of the parapets (between ridges 1/3, 2/4, and 6/8). By comparing the roof plans to the floor plans, it does not appear they are for a purpose that would allow an exception (elevator, stair, mechanical equipment), as the buildings do not have elevators, the stairs are located elsewhere, and the mechanical equipment is ground mounted. Though parapet heights are not included on the roof height schedule, they are shown on the plans. The westernmost parapet exceeds 27 feet above natural grade, which is the highest it would be permitted to go if alternate standards were maximized. Though these heights are the same as the adjacent ridge lines, sloped roofs are given a height exception that a flat roof is not. If the parapet were reduced to no more than 27 feet, the building would have the same unrelieved building plane issues the lodging buildings have in that the methods being used to reduce the size of the building planes are not acceptable.

*The parapet that was too tall has been reduced to not exceed maximum permitted height; the building now requires 10 points under alternate standards. Unrelieved building planes have been reduced to under 400 square feet. The elevations include a note that the windows will be recessed; a minimum recession of 1' is required.*

- Multi-family South: No alternate standards needed
  - The Multi-family South Buildings all have 3.5:12 pitched roofs, which permits a height of 27 feet before alternate are needed. All buildings are below this height. No alternate standards are needed; the multi-family south buildings comply with height requirements.

*No changes were needed or are proposed for the Multi-family South Buildings.*

Many of the buildings are applying the permitted height exceptions of LDC Section 2.24.E(3), Table 2.7, including for chimneys, elevators, mechanical equipment, stairs, etc. While some exceptions have been applied correctly, others have not or are shown in a way that does not allow for review. For example:

- The elevators for the lobby/restaurant building are shown at a width of 50 feet on the floorplans and 60 feet on the height exhibit. At 60 feet, this area would exceed the maximum of 5% of the building footprint allowed for elevators and violate LDC Section 5.7.F(2)c.6, which limits rooflines to 50 feet. Further, the floorplans show the elevators at a width of approximately 25 feet, with the remaining area being used for storage. As the height increase is only permitted for elevators and associated supporting structures, this is not an appropriate use of the exception.

*The elevators at the lobby/restaurant building have been redesigned to reduce the width/roofline and is now only counting the actual area of the elevators and equipment for the height exception.*

- Mechanical equipment is shown on a portion of the lobby/restaurant building (southwest side of building) without a height. Based on the heights of the surrounding building and cross referencing the elevations, it appears that this section would likely comply, but the plans would need to show that height for verification.

*A height has still not been provided for this section of the building. Further, while the original plans showed the mechanical area a minimum of 6' from the edge of the roof (as required by code), the revised plans show the mechanical equipment extending to the edge of the roof. If the height exception is needed for this area, a 6' setback from the edge of the roof is required.*

- The floorplans show the areas designated for the elevators on the guest room buildings as including space over the entry/lobby and stairs, which is not an appropriate use of the elevator exception. The exception for stairs is separate from the exception for elevators and is included in the exception for mechanical equipment. The exception for stairs and mechanical equipment is limited to 5% of the building footprint, which is maxed out by the stairs and mechanical equipment elsewhere on the building, so no additional increases are permitted for stairs.

*The sections show the area being used as the stair exception containing mechanical equipment. While stairs and mechanical equipment count towards the same exception, areas being used for mechanical equipment screening are required to be setback from the edge of the roof by a minimum of 6', which this area is not. As additional height appears to be needed for the mechanical equipment screening and not the stairwell, this is an inappropriate application of the exception and would need to be redesigned.*

*However, while the section (Sheet A-30) shows this area being at the edge of the roof, the floor plans and elevations would indicate that there is an enclosed lounge, not an open patio, in this area of the building. If there is an enclosed lounge, the mechanical equipment may be 6' from the edge of the roof. This would need to be clarified and modified if necessary.*

- For the guest room buildings, the area shown on the roof plans as being for the stairs/mechanical equipment height exception scales to a larger size than is stated on the plans. As the stated square footages maximize the 5% allowance of the building footprint, the applicant would need to refine the measurements and ensure the areas meet the maximum size allowed.

*The square footages have been refined and all appear to be under the permitted maximum area for each building.*

Compliance:     Yes             Partial             No             Not Applicable

*If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the project, the following would be recommended conditions of approval:*

*The plans submitted for building permits shall comply with all applicable Land Development Code requirements and incorporate the following changes from the plans reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission:*

- *Plans submitted for building permits shall comply with height requirements, including alternate standards, unrelieved building plane requirements, and permitted height exceptions including the following:*
  - *Largest unrelieved building planes on Lobby Building, Treehouse Suites, West Wing, North Wing, and Multi-family North shall be limited to 400 square feet. Largest unrelieved building planes on East Wing shall be limited to 450 square feet.*
  - *Windows and doors shall count towards the unrelieved building plane area unless they are recessed or project by a minimum of 1 foot.*
  - *Areas applying the height exception for mechanical equipment shall be setback a minimum of 6' from all roof edges.*

**LDC Article 3: Use Regulations**

3.2.E: Table of Allowed Uses

*Evaluation:* Lodging and Multifamily developments are permitted uses in the L zone.

*Compliance:*  Yes  Partial  No  Not Applicable

3.3: Use Specific Standards

*Evaluation:* LDC Section 3.3.A(3) states that, for mixed-use projects, residential uses shall not be located on the same level as the primary street entrance to the building unless permitted by the Director or Planning and Zoning Commission. While the project is considered a mixed-use project (lodging and residential), the project has also been designed with a clear distinction between the lodging and residential uses. If the rezoning to L is approved, Staff would be supportive of this design and permitting residential uses on the same level as the primary street entrance to the building.

LDC Section 3.3.C(14) contains the use specific standards for lodging projects. The lodging buildings are limited to 150 feet in length (project complies) and the project is considered a high-density lodging project requiring a zone change, which this project has applied for. Other use specific standards address expansion of existing lodging facilities, which do not apply to this project.

*Compliance:*  Yes  Partial  No  Not Applicable

**LDC Article 5: Development Standards**

5.3: Grading and Drainage

5.3.D: General Standards

*Evaluation:* The site has been previously graded. While little natural grade exists, the buildings have been sited to preserve existing trees to the greatest extent possible. All work, except for driveways to connect to existing streets and landscaping, is contained within the property boundaries. The City's Public Works staff has reviewed the Preliminary Grading and Drainage Report and Plan and found them to be consistent with City requirements. A Final Grading and Drainage Report and Plan sealed by a Professional Engineer would be required to be submitted, reviewed, and approved prior to building permit issuance. A geotechnical report has been provided to ensure that the underground portions of the project (meeting facility and parking garage) are appropriately designed for the site.

*Compliance:*  Yes  Partial  No  Not Applicable

5.4: Access, Connectivity, and Circulation

5.4.D: Street Connectivity

*Evaluation:* The project connects to existing streets at two points (W SR 89A & Saddlerock Circle). The connection to W SR 89A is at the Soldiers Pass Road light, giving this development, along with the Saddlerock Homes subdivision to the south, access to a controlled intersection. Earlier iterations of the plans included a vehicular connection to Elk Road to the east of the project site, which was removed due to the parking garage. Staff has provided comments that this connection needed to be added back, in accordance with the LDC and the recommendations of the CFA plan.

	<p>The proposal includes a 3' walking path to connect this property with the property to the west, which does not meet the requirements for a vehicular connection or a pedestrian connection (minimum of 5' wide would be recommended for a pedestrian connection; shared use paths are typically 8' – 10' wide).</p> <p>Rather than a 5' sidewalk on each side of the new street, the applicant is proposing a 10' wide sidewalk on one side of the new connector street.</p> <p>Police and Fire and reviewed the plans and have not expressed any concerns with the site layout. No cul-de-sacs or dead end streets are proposed, and no gates are proposed.</p> <p><i>The plans have been amended to include a connection through the parking structure to Elk Road. A 5' sidewalk along the west side of Elk Road has also been provided. If the project is approved and constructed, the property owner would need to record a public access easement prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.</i></p>
	<p>Compliance: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Compliance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p><i>If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the project, the following would be recommended conditions of approval:</i></p> <p><i>Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, staff shall verify that all construction is in substantial accordance with the plans as submitted, reviewed, and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission, and meets the following conditions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The applicant shall record a cross access easement and maintenance agreement with the City of Sedona for the new connector road and the connection through the parking structure to Elk Road and record the easement in the Yavapai County Recorder's Office. The easement shall also include any areas where the proposed sidewalks along Saddlerock Circle, W State Route 89A, and Elk Road encroach onto private property. The easement shall be provided for vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle access and the easement language shall be reviewed and approved by City Staff prior to recordation.</i></li> </ul>
	<p>5.4.E: Driveways and Access</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> Driveways are located to provide safe access to and from the site. Cars will be able to enter and exist the site in forward drive. The majority of the parking is located within the parking garage, which is accessible by one of two driveways. Staff had requested that the design of the pull out to the hotel entrance be modified to reduce the possibility that cars accidentally pull into the entrance rather than continue on the street. The applicant has proposed a change in paving color and pattern in this area.</p> <p>Police and Fire have reviewed the plans and have not expressed any concerns. Driveways and drive aisles will meet materials requirements.</p> <p>The property fronts W SR 89A and provides a singular point of access from the highway. Deceleration lanes are also proposed along the highway. A permit from ADOT would be required prior to construction.</p> <p>Two access points are provided, and the drive aisles meet size requirements.</p> <p>Compliance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>5.4.F: Visibility Triangles</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> No buildings are in visibility triangles. Landscaping in visibility triangles will be maintained to meet sight distance requirements.</p> <p>Compliance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>5.4.G: Cross-Access between Adjacent Uses</p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> The site design does not provide cross access to the properties to the east. Earlier iterations of the plan included a vehicular connection to Elk Road to the east of the project site. This connection was removed due to the parking garage. Staff provided comments that this connection needed to be added back into the plans, in accordance with the LDC and the recommendations of the CFA plan. The proposal includes a 3' walking path to connect this property with the property to the west, which does not meet the requirements for a vehicular connection or a pedestrian connection (minimum of 5' wide would be</p>



	<p>recommended for a pedestrian connection; shared use paths are typically 8’ – 10’ wide). While Elk Road is private and responsibility for it is unclear, at a minimum the development should incorporate a location for a future connection and should not design a project that precludes a future connection.</p> <p><i>The plans have been amended to include a connection through the parking structure to Elk Road. A 5’ sidewalk along the west side of Elk Road has also been provided. If the project is approved and constructed, the property owner would need to record a public access easement prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.</i></p>
	<p>Compliance: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Compliance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p><i>If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the project, the following would be recommended conditions of approval:</i></p> <p><i>Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, staff shall verify that all construction is in substantial accordance with the plans as submitted, reviewed, and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission, and meets the following conditions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• The applicant shall record a cross access easement and maintenance agreement with the City of Sedona for the new connector road and the connection through the parking structure to Elk Road and record the easement in the Yavapai County Recorder’s Office. The easement shall also include any areas where the proposed sidewalks along Saddlerock Circle, W State Route 89A, and Elk Road encroach onto private property. The easement shall be provided for vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle access and the easement language shall be reviewed and approved by City Staff prior to recordation.</i></li> </ul>
	<p>5.4.H: Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation</p>
	<p>Evaluation: Sidewalks or shared use paths are proposed to be installed along W SR 89A, Saddlerock Circle (extended into Saddlerock neighborhood), and the new connector road. A sidewalk is only provided along a portion of Elk Road. The applicant has proposed a 3’ granite path along the remainder of Elk Road, which does not meet the minimum width of 5’ (LDC Section 5.4.H(2)b).</p> <p>Pedestrian access is provided from the sidewalks to each building in the development/all areas listed in this section as requiring connections.</p> <p><i>The plans have been amended to include a connection through the parking structure to Elk Road. A 5’ sidewalk along the west side of Elk Road has also been provided. If the project is approved and constructed, the property owner would need to record a public access easement prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.</i></p>
	<p>Compliance: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p>Compliance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p><i>If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the project, the following would be recommended conditions of approval:</i></p> <p><i>Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, staff shall verify that all construction is in substantial accordance with the plans as submitted, reviewed, and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission, and meets the following conditions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• The applicant shall record a cross access easement and maintenance agreement with the City of Sedona for the new connector road and the connection through the parking structure to Elk Road and record the easement in the Yavapai County Recorder’s Office. The easement shall also include any areas where the proposed sidewalks along Saddlerock Circle, W State Route 89A, and Elk Road encroach onto private property. The easement shall be provided for vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle access and the easement language shall be reviewed and approved by City Staff prior to recordation.</i></li> </ul>
	<p>5.5: Off-Street Parking and Loading</p>
	<p>5.5.D: Minimum Off-Street Parking Spaces Required</p>

*Evaluation:* The parking analysis states 196 parking spaces are required and 205 parking spaces are provided. City staff has provided comments on the parking analysis that have not been satisfactorily addressed, including the following:

- Conference center parking: Parking for the conference center has not been addressed in the parking analysis. The LDC states “Accessory uses to lodging, such as meeting rooms and restaurants, shall be required to provide parking at the rates for those specific use types except that the Director may reduce those requirements for accessory uses that are clearly designed for only hotel guests.” This approach has been taken for the restaurant use, but not for the conference center.
- Shared parking: The project documents state that there will be a shuttle available for guests to get around town (guests leave their car at the hotel) while the parking analysis assumes that the hotel parking spaces will be available during the day for other uses (guest parking vacated during the day). Staff has requested more detail regarding this arrangement, wanting to ensure that the proper assumptions have been made in the parking analysis.
- Restaurant/bar parking: The project documents state that the hotel will limit non-guest use of the restaurant/bar to 50%. No details for how this will be managed have been provided.

*While some additional information has been provided, some questions have remained unaddressed, particularly how shared parking will work if hotel guests opt to use public transportation and leave their cars at the hotel. Other assumptions are based on management of the facility, which is dependent on the applicant following through on the commitments they have made. If the Commission chooses to recommend approval of the project, this could be addressed through the development agreement (see recommended condition of approval below).*

The project plans are inconsistent with the mix of housing unit types proposed. A different unit mix could slightly change the number of required parking spaces.

*This has been corrected.*

Without responses to these comments and the needed clarifications, Staff does not feel comfortable with accepting the conclusions of the parking analysis.

*Staff still has outstanding questions, including whether an assumption of no additional staff and 100% of meeting use being hotel guests is reasonable and how encouraging use of public transit and bicycles may impact the shared parking assumptions, and has not approved the parking analysis as submitted.*

*If the project is approved with the recommended condition of approval (below), there may be sufficient allowances for the applicant to prove that their assumptions are correct as well as remedies should parking become an issue for the project.*

20 covered parking spaces are required. The lower level of the parking garage meets this requirement.

Bus parking is provided in the surface parking lot on the west side of the site.

A minimum of 20 bicycle parking spaces are required and are provided. The developer would be encouraged to increase the number of bicycle parking spaces, particularly for the multifamily portion of the project.

*The applicant has added additional bicycle parking throughout the development along with providing secured bicycle storage for hotel guests.*

**Compliance:**     Yes             Partial             No             Not Applicable

*If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the project, the following would be recommended conditions of approval:*

*Prior to the issuance of grading and building permits, the applicant shall enter into a Development Agreement with the City of Sedona that covers, at a minimum, the following items:*

- *Management of parking areas, including non-guest use of hotel amenities (restaurant, bar, meeting facility), and measures to be taken if parking becomes an issue for the project.*

	<p><b>5.5.E: Parking Alternatives, Credits, and Adjustments</b></p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> The applicant has provided a parking analysis in an attempt to show how shared parking would work. As outlined in the previous section, staff has outstanding comments on this analysis that have not been addressed by the applicant and would need to be addressed before the proposed shared parking could be approved.</p> <p><i>Staff still has outstanding questions, including whether an assumption of no additional staff and 100% of meeting use being hotel guests is reasonable and how encouraging use of public transit and bicycles may impact the shared parking assumptions, and has not approved the parking analysis as submitted.</i></p> <p><i>If the project is approved with the recommended condition of approval (below), there may be sufficient allowances for the applicant to prove that their assumptions are correct as well as remedies should parking become an issue for the project.</i></p> <p>No compact parking or motorcycle spaces are proposed, and no reductions based on transit access are requested.</p> <p><b>Compliance:</b>    <input type="checkbox"/> Yes            <input type="checkbox"/> Partial            <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No            <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p><i>If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the project, the following would be recommended conditions of approval:</i></p> <p><i>Prior to the issuance of grading and building permits, the applicant shall enter into a Development Agreement with the City of Sedona that covers, at a minimum, the following items:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Management of parking areas, including non-guest use of hotel amenities (restaurant, bar, meeting facility), and measures to be taken if parking becomes an issue for the project.</i></li> </ul>
	<p><b>5.5.F: Off-Street Parking Layout and Design</b></p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> Parking spaces will be required to be available for parking. No parking is in a fire lane. Parking is located on the interior of the site and not between building facades and the public right-of-way. Parking areas and drive aisles comply with all dimensional standards of the LDC and Administrative Manual. Landscaping and lighting are provided in compliance with LDC requirements.</p> <p><b>Compliance:</b>    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes            <input type="checkbox"/> Partial            <input type="checkbox"/> No            <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p><b>5.5.G: Loading and Stacking Areas</b></p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> 3 loading spaces are required (minimum size of 14' wide x 50' long x 14' high). None are provided.</p> <p><i>The plans have been amended to include 2 loading spaces to the west of the Treehouse Suites building and one loading space in the pull through/porte-cochere area.</i></p> <p><b>Compliance:</b>    <input type="checkbox"/> Yes            <input type="checkbox"/> Partial            <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No            <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>5.6: Landscaping, Buffering, and Screening</b></p>	
	<p><b>5.6.C: Landscaping and Buffering</b></p> <p><i>Evaluation: *Note: The numbers provided on the plans are not always consistent with each other. Discrepancies are noted in the following evaluation.</i></p> <p>(1) General Landscape Standards: Based on the landscape area, 271 trees are required. Based on size, the trees to be preserved provide a credit of 97 trees, for a net requirement of 174 new trees. 185-200 new trees are provided. Based on the landscape area, 813 shrubs are required, and 816-881 shrubs are provided.</p> <p>58% of the plants on the landscape plan are native species. (70% of trees and 54% of shrubs). The balance of the plants are adaptive. No inappropriate species are proposed. 21 different species are proposed (not including existing trees) and no one species makes up more than 50% of the required landscape materials. Visibility triangles will be maintained. The applicant expects to be able to save</p>

27 trees (protect in place), factored into the native/adaptive percentages as native. Compliance with the other requirements of this section will be reviewed when plans are submitted for permits.

(2) The areas between the buildings and streets are landscaped. Parking areas, where adjacent to streets, are screened with landscaped areas a minimum of 5 feet in width. While the plans state that more than 10% of the parking areas are landscaped, the plans do not clearly show which areas are being counted for parking areas/parking lot landscaping. If the project were to move forward, the applicant would need to clearly show how this percentage is being calculated. Landscaped areas are located appropriately throughout the site and where required for screening and buffering purposes.

*The resubmitted plans include a calculation of landscape area in the parking lots (minimum 10% of the parking area must be landscaped). The surface area of the parking structure is 32,500 square feet, with 3,300 square feet of landscaping (10.1%). The parking lot on the western side of the site is 15,400 square feet with 3,000 square feet of landscaping (19.5%).*

(3) Where the property abuts a single family residential zone on the southern property line, a 6' tall masonry wall is provided.

(4) Landscape areas will be required to be maintained after installation.

(5) A tree preservation and protection plan has been submitted. It is anticipated that 27 trees will be preserved.

Compliance:  Yes  Partial  No  Not Applicable

Compliance:  Yes  Partial  No  Not Applicable

5.6.D: Screening

*Evaluation:*

(1) Roof mounted equipment is screened on all sides. As outlined in the height section, some of these areas may need to be reduced in size/redesigned to ensure height requirements are met.

*As outlined in the height section, there are still a few areas where rooftop screening needs some clarification (primarily distance from edge of roof). If approved, Staff may review this at the building permit stage.*

(2) Any additional ground mounted equipment will be screened by patio walls or landscaping.

(3) Loading and service areas, though required, have not been shown on the plans, and would need to be screened. Trash enclosures have been provided. Staff has concerns as to whether the number provided (one dumpster for the hotel, one for the residential units) is sufficient.

*While loading areas have been added to the plans, screening of these areas is not clear. This may be added as a potential condition of approval and verified at building permit stage.*

(4) No outdoor storage areas are proposed.

Compliance:  Yes  Partial  No  Not Applicable

*If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the project, the following would be recommended conditions of approval:*

*The plans submitted for building permits shall comply with all applicable Land Development Code requirements and incorporate the following changes from the plans reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission:*

- *Plans submitted for building permits shall comply with height requirements, including alternate standards, unrelieved building plane requirements, and permitted height exceptions including the following:*
  - *Areas applying the height exception for mechanical equipment shall be setback a minimum of 6' from all roof edges.*
  - *Loading areas shall be screened in compliance with LDC Section 5.6.D(3).*

5.6.E: Fences and Walls

	<p><i>Evaluation:</i> Most fences are located outside of the setbacks. The screen wall along the south property line will have columns every 10 feet to break up the wall as well as landscaping between the wall and the shared use path. Fences and walls located within front and exterior side setbacks will be required to comply with height requirements. Fences and walls will maintain visibility triangle requirements. Fences and walls will meet color and material requirements. Materials listed as prohibited are not proposed. Where walls are proposed adjacent to a public street, landscaping is provided between the street and wall. No retaining wall exceeds 8 feet in height, and all are designed to meet design and color requirements.</p> <p><b>Compliance:</b>   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i>            <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partial</i>            <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i>            <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Applicable</i></p>
<p><b>5.7: Site and Building Design</b></p>	
<p><b>5.7.D: Site Design</b></p>	
	<p><i>Evaluation:</i> The site has been graded/disturbed in the past and the existing grades are lower than natural grades. As part of the site plan review process, the applicant submitted a plan that approximates what natural grades were. This plan was approved by the Community Development Department and has been used in evaluation of the proposal. Based on this, the site slopes from a high point in the southeast corner of the site to the low point in the northwest corner. While there is a floodplain to the west of the site, there are no floodplains on the site and there are no significant natural features. The buildings have been sited to preserve existing trees where possible.</p> <p>The plans show sidewalks along street frontages (except for Elk Road) and connections from sidewalks to the interior of the site. While trash/recycling areas have been provided, they do not appear to be enough to effectively serve the size of the development and the site has not made provisions for loading/unloading areas, as required by the LDC. Lack of these areas will impact the circulation of the site, as delivery trucks would need to disrupt the circulation patterns (parking lots, road) in order to make their deliveries.</p> <p>All new utilities and existing utilities serving the site will be underground.</p> <p><i>The site plan has been changed to include sidewalks along Elk Road and vehicle and pedestrian connections to all areas of the site. The trash enclosure for the hotel has been enlarged to provide both trash and recycling dumpsters and additional dumpsters have been added near the multifamily uses. 3 loading spaces have been provided, however, one of them (labeled "short term loading" on the site plan) has been provided in the pull through area near the hotel entrance which may impact circulation patterns of the hotel, depending on how it is used.</i></p> <p><b>Compliance:</b>   <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i>            <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partial</i>            <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i>            <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Applicable</i></p>
<p><b>Compliance:</b>   <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i>            <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Partial</i>            <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i>            <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Applicable</i></p>	
<p><b>5.7.E: Building Placement and Orientation</b></p>	
	<p><i>Evaluation:</i> The lodging buildings have been arranged around the pool area and the multifamily buildings have been arranged around the parking garage. The entire development is arranged around the new Soldiers Pass Connector through the middle of the site.</p> <p>The site has been designed to have driveways/garages accessed from the interior of the site, shielding most of the parking from the public rights-of-way with buildings or in the structure.</p> <p>Buildings less than 20 feet apart meet the building separation requirements of subsection 3.</p> <p><b>Compliance:</b>   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i>            <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partial</i>            <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i>            <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Applicable</i></p>
<p><b>5.7.F: Building Design</b></p>	
	<p><i>Evaluation:</i></p> <p>(2) <b>Building Massing:</b> Each building contains a minimum of 3 masses in both plan and elevation views. Massing is visible from the public rights-of-way. Structures for screening rooftop mechanical equipment were not considered when massing was evaluated.</p> <p><i>The Guest Room buildings have been slightly redesigned, which included a change in height for a portion of the building. This change in height resulted in less than a 3' vertical difference between sections of the buildings that previous had at least a 3' vertical distance, bringing the building out of compliance with massing</i></p>

*requirements. The buildings would need to be redesigned again to incorporate a 3' vertical difference and heights would then need to be reevaluated to ensure any increased heights are still compliant.*

**Building Proportions and Scale:** The buildings are all similar in height. The tallest building is the "Treehouse Suites" building, which is located away from the public right-of-way, but on the south end of the development, closest to the existing residential development. These buildings have an increased setback and use a sloped roof for the upper stories.

**Building Articulation:** The buildings are broken up into a series of smaller components and incorporate recessions, projections, changes in masonry patterns, etc., at least every 30 feet. The upper stories are at least 10% smaller than the lower stories and no building plane exceeds 800 sf, though, as outlined in the height evaluation, multiple building planes would need to be modified to comply with height requirements.

Transparency (subsection c.5): The plans do not include the transparency calculations for each façade facing a public right-of-way (LDC Section 5.7.F(2)c.5.ii), compliance cannot be verified. It appears that the end elevations of the lodging buildings along with the north elevation of the multifamily buildings would not comply with the transparency requirements.

*The buildings have been modified to add doors and windows on the elevations that face the streets. Though the calculations on the elevations show that the 1<sup>st</sup> floor of the buildings have a minimum of 30% doors and windows and the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor has a minimum of 15%, these calculations appear to include portions of windows behind solid walls. As the entire window cannot be seen from the public street/public area, this design does not meet the code. When those areas are taken out of the calculation, the total percentages would likely fall below the minimum requirement.*

Roofline Variation (subsection c.6): The plans are inconsistent. Some plans show rooflines exceeding 50 feet in length while on other plans, these same rooflines are shown at 50 feet or less. If the project were to move forward, the plans would need to be consistent with each other and show compliance with this requirement.

*The plans have been modified and no roofline exceeds 50 feet.*

**Building Length:** No building exceeds 150 feet in length.

- (3) There is not a predominant architectural style or character in the immediate vicinity of the project. The most prominent buildings in the area are within the Whole Foods center across W SR 89A. These buildings would complement the architectural style seen in that shopping center. The project has been designed in compliance with the general standards of the LDC. The buildings are not designed as signage and all buildings use the same or a complementary design.
- (4) No mirrored or reflective surfaces are proposed. No exterior finishes on the prohibited list are proposed.
- (5) The maximum light reflectance value proposed is 17%, in compliance with general color requirements and the more restrictive color requirements based on building height.

Compliance:  Yes  Partial  No  Not Applicable

*If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the project, the following would be recommended conditions of approval:*

*The plans submitted for building permits shall comply with all applicable Land Development Code requirements and incorporate the following changes from the plans reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission:*

- *Plans shall comply with massing requirements, including the following:*

- *All buildings shall have a minimum of 3 masses in both plan and elevation view. (LDC Section 5.7.F(2)) Building modifications to meet massing requirements shall not bring the building out of compliance with height requirements.*
- *The ground-floor level of each façade facing a public street or other public area such as a plaza, park, or sidewalk shall contain a minimum of 30 percent windows or doorways. Upper floors of each façade facing a public street shall contain a minimum of 15 percent windows. (LDC Section 5.7.F(2)c.5). Areas of windows and doors behind a solid wall that is incorporated into the building design, making that portion of the window or door not visible from the public street/public area shall not count towards this calculation.*

**5.8: Exterior Lighting**

**5.8.E: General Lighting Standards**

*Evaluation:*

- (1) All lighting is proposed at 2700K, with the exception of the landscape lighting and the lighting for the lower level of the parking structure, both of which are shown at 3000K. Landscape lighting is permitted to be 3000K, but parking lot lighting (including within parking structures) is required to be 2700K.
- (2) No prohibited lighting types are proposed.
- (3) All proposed light fixtures are fully shielded.
- (4) The site is approximately 6.36 acres, allowing for a total lighting output of 445,200 lumens. 395,212 lumens are proposed (lighting on the lower level of the parking garage does not count towards this limit).
- (5) No motion sensor lights are proposed. Lodging (24-hour business) and residential lighting is not subject to time limitations.

**Compliance:**  Yes  Partial  No  Not Applicable

**5.8.F: Supplemental Class 3 Lighting Standards**

*Evaluation:* The landscape lighting would be considered Class 3 lighting, but is proposed as fully shielded (not uplighting), so no additional requirements apply.

**Compliance:**  Yes  Partial  No  Not Applicable

**5.8.G: Parking Area Lighting**

*Evaluation:* Parking lot lighting for the top level of the parking structure and surface lot is 2700K, fully shielded, and the lighting poles are 8-12 feet in height. Lighting on the lower level of the parking garage is shown at 3000K and would need to be reduced to 2700K.

*An updated lighting plan for the lower level of the parking structure was not included in the resubmittal.*

**Compliance:**  Yes  Partial  No  Not Applicable

*If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the project, the following would be recommended conditions of approval:*

*The plans submitted for building permits shall comply with all applicable Land Development Code requirements and incorporate the following changes from the plans reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission:*

- *Plans shall comply with lighting requirements, including the following:*
  - *Lighting on the lower level of the parking structure shall be considered Class 2 lighting and limited to a maximum Correlated Color Temperature (CCT) of 2700K.*

**5.8.H: Pedestrian Walkway Lighting**

*Evaluation:* Pedestrian walkway lighting is Class 2 lighting and meets all applicable requirements.

**Compliance:**  Yes  Partial  No  Not Applicable

	<p><b>5.8.I: Exterior Building Lighting</b></p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> Exterior building lighting is considered Class 1 lighting and meets all applicable requirements.</p> <p><i>Compliance:</i>    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes            <input type="checkbox"/> Partial            <input type="checkbox"/> No            <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p><b>5.8.J: Sign Illumination</b></p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> The sign plans indicate that the signs will be illuminated. No sign lighting has been included on the lighting plan. Sign lighting would need to be added to ensure the project does not exceed maximum allowable lumen levels.</p> <p><i>Sign lighting has not been added to the lighting plan or the sign plan.</i></p> <p><i>Compliance:</i>    <input type="checkbox"/> Yes            <input type="checkbox"/> Partial            <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No            <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
	<p><i>If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the project, the following would be recommended conditions of approval:</i></p> <p><i>The plans submitted for building permits shall comply with all applicable Land Development Code requirements and incorporate the following changes from the plans reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Plans shall comply with all sign requirements, including the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Sign lighting shall be added to the lighting plan and comply with all applicable requirements. Overall site lighting shall not exceed maximum lumen levels when sign lighting is added.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	<p><b>5.8.K: Supplemental Lighting Standards for Specific Uses</b></p> <p><i>Evaluation:</i> None of these standards apply to this project.</p> <p><i>Compliance:</i>    <input type="checkbox"/> Yes            <input type="checkbox"/> Partial            <input type="checkbox"/> No            <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>5.9: Public Art</b></p>	
	<p><i>Evaluation:</i> Public art is required for this project. The project plans designate a location for public art between the parking structure and the connector road. If the project is approved, a public art plan will be required to be submitted for review and approval by the Community Development Director and public art must be installed prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the project. If the project does not install artwork, a cash contribution based on the square footage of the project would be required.</p> <p><i>Compliance:</i>    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes            <input type="checkbox"/> Partial            <input type="checkbox"/> No            <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>Article 6: Signs</b></p>	
<p><b>6.5: General Standards Applicable to All Signs</b></p>	
	<p><i>Evaluation:</i> The proposed signs comply with all standards in this section, with the exception of the following: The visibility triangle at the corner of 89A and the new connector road is shown at 10' – this would need to be increased to 30' (the note on the plans is correct).</p> <p><i>Plans have been corrected.</i></p> <p><i>Compliance:</i>    <input type="checkbox"/> Yes            <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partial            <input type="checkbox"/> No            <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p> <p><i>Compliance:</i>    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes            <input type="checkbox"/> Partial            <input type="checkbox"/> No            <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>
<p><b>6.6: Sign Measurements and Calculations</b></p>	
	<p><i>Evaluation:</i></p> <p>(A) <b>Sign Area:</b> Sign area is calculated incorrectly, but the plans include more area than the code would require, so calculating correctly would decrease the size of the signs. This may help where the signs are shown at greater than the permitted sizes (see evaluation under Section 6.9)</p> <p>(B) <b>Sign Height:</b> Sign height is calculated correctly and signs comply with the maximum heights.</p> <p>(C) <b>Items of Information:</b> Signs comply with requirements for the maximum number of items of information.</p> <p><i>Compliance:</i>    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes            <input type="checkbox"/> Partial            <input type="checkbox"/> No            <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>



6.7: Design Standards Applicable to All Signs

*Evaluation:*

- (A) **Sign Legibility:** Signs comply with the maximum items of information and number of font styles permitted.
- (B) **Sign Placement:** Signs are placed in accordance with the requirements of this section.
- (C) **Sign Color:** Signs are proposed as cut out metal letters, so the buildings, which comply with color requirements, will act as the sign background. Where a sign background is needed (directory signs), the sign background will complement the building.
- (D) **Sign Materials:** Signs will use acceptable materials. All building signs will use cut out metal letters, which would allow for an increase in sign area. The signs have not used this additional area, which may help where the signs are shown at great than the permitted sizes (see Section 6.9).
- (E) **Sign Illumination:** The sign plans state that the signs will be illuminated, but illumination details have not been provided on the sign plans or on the lighting plans. Additional information would be needed to complete this review.

*Sign lighting has not been added to the lighting plan or the sign plan.*

**Compliance:**     Yes             Partial             No             Not Applicable

*If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the project, the following would be recommended conditions of approval:*

*The plans submitted for building permits shall comply with all applicable Land Development Code requirements and incorporate the following changes from the plans reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission:*

- *Plans shall comply with all sign requirements, including the following:*
  - *Sign lighting shall be added to the lighting plan and comply with all applicable requirements. Overall site lighting shall not exceed maximum lumen levels when sign lighting is added.*

6.8: Exempt Signs

*Evaluation:* The plans include the following exempt signs:

- Information signs. While the plans show multiple information signs, no information has been provided regarding what the purpose of these signs is or what types of information they will have. While a note has been added to the plans stating that the signs will comply with the code definition of informational signs (see below), it is unclear why these signs would need to be scattered throughout the property. Further, the code limits information signs to a maximum of 2 sf per business entrance. If the information signs don't end up meeting these definitions and limitations, they may not be exempt and would need to be evaluated based on the appropriate sign type.
  - *The LDC defines Informational Signs as: A sign used to indicate or provide information or direction with respect to permitted uses on the property, including, but not limited to, signs indicating the hours of operation, and such signs as "No Smoking," "Open," "Closed," "Restrooms," "No Solicitors," "Deliveries In Rear," current credit card signs, trade association emblems, and the like.*

*No additional information on the proposed information signs is provided.*

- On-Site Directional Signs: While no on-site directional signs are shown, the information or directory signs may fit better into this category. On-site directional signs are limited to a maximum of 1 per property unless approved as part of a master sign plan.

*No additional information on the proposed on-site directional signs is provided.*

- Street Address Signs: Each building contains a street address sign.

**Compliance:**     Yes             Partial             No             Not Applicable

*If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the project, the following would be recommended conditions of approval:*

*The plans submitted for building permits shall comply with all applicable Land Development Code requirements and incorporate the following changes from the plans reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission:*

- *A complete master sign plan shall be submitted, including the following:*
  - *Detailed information for all proposed signs, to allow for review for compliance with sign types, sizes, locations, heights, etc. The master sign plan shall comply with all code requirements, except those that may be modified by the Director. If a standard may be modified by the Director, the master sign plan shall include details for that request for review and potential approval by the Director. Any modification to a standard that requires approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission shall be applied for as an amendment to the Development Review approval and heard by the Commission at a public hearing.*

6.9: Permanent Signs (Commercial Districts)

*Evaluation:*

- (A) For sign computation purposes, the entire project is considered a single development site.
- (B) The property is a development site with two or more tenants (lodging and multifamily), with sign allowances allotted separately. Each use is large enough to qualify for the maximum allotment of 50 sf. The multifamily uses would need to split the allotted 50 sf. The sign plans show each multifamily building getting its down 50 sf, which is incorrect.

**Building Signs:** For the hotel, the plans include 5 building signs – one for the lobby and one for each of the guest room buildings. The lobby sign is 18 sf and the guest room building signs are 8 sf each, for a total of 50 sf. As all signs are cut out metal letters, a 20% increase in the total allowed sign area is permitted, for a maximum of 60 sf.

For the multifamily buildings, a total of 4 signs are shown at 20 sf each, for a total of 80 sf. As all signs are cut out metal letters, a 20% increase in the total allowed sign area is permitted, for a maximum of 60 sf. However, the sign area on the plans is measured incorrectly (more area included than needs to be). If the signs were measured correctly, they may fall within the allowable square footage. If they don't, the 10 sf not used on the hotel building could be transferred to the multifamily buildings as part of the master sign plan.

- (C) **Monument Signs:** Based on the size of the property, two monument signs are permitted, and two are proposed at 8 feet in height and 25 sf. As the signs are located within a landscaped area and use dimensional lettering, they would be eligible for increases in size or height, but are not applying these increases, which could be transferred to the multifamily buildings. The monument signs are located on the 89A frontage, but are more than 250 feet apart, in compliance with code requirements. The plans include a note that the monument signs will be located outside of the 30' visibility triangle at each intersection. The visibility triangle at the corner of 89A and the new road is shown at 10' – this would need to be increased to 30' (and in compliance with the note on the plans). The monument signs are designed in the same style as the buildings and would be consistent with the architecture of the site.

**Directional Signs:** Directional signs are not proposed at driveway entrances.

**Directory Signs:** Directory signs are proposed at pedestrian entrances to the site, at places where customers would be exiting parking areas and entering the site. The code permits a maximum of 2 directory signs; 3 are proposed. The increased number of directory signs may be approved through a master sign plan. They are proposed as monument signs, a maximum of 6 feet in height, and would provide directional information to help guests get to the correct area of the site (building and room

		<p>numbers, restaurant, etc.). Directory signs are typically used for multi-tenant office complexes; as described, these signs may fit better into the on-site directional sign category.</p> <p><i>No significant changes to the Master Sign Plan have been proposed or additional information provided that would clarify what is being proposed.</i></p>
<p><b>Compliance:</b>    <input type="checkbox"/> Yes            <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Partial</i>            <input type="checkbox"/> No            <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>		<p><i>If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the project, the following would be recommended conditions of approval:</i></p> <p><i>The plans submitted for building permits shall comply with all applicable Land Development Code requirements and incorporate the following changes from the plans reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>A complete master sign plan shall be submitted, including the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Detailed information for all proposed signs, to allow for review for compliance with sign types, sizes, locations, heights, etc. The master sign plan shall comply with all code requirements, except those that may be modified by the Director. If a standard may be modified by the Director, the master sign plan shall include details for that request for review and potential approval by the Director. Any modification to a standard that requires approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission shall be applied for as an amendment to the Development Review approval and heard by the Commission at a public hearing.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## Conditions of Approval

PZ19-00005 (ZC, DEV) Village at  
Saddlerock Crossing



City of Sedona

Community Development Department

102 Roadrunner Drive Sedona, AZ 86336  
(928) 282-1154 • [www.sedonaaz.gov/cd](http://www.sedonaaz.gov/cd)

---

***As recommended by Staff, February 6, 2024\*\****

***\*\*Note: Staff's overall recommendation is for denial of the project. If the Planning and Zoning Commission chooses to approve the project, the following would be the recommended conditions of approval.***

### **PZ19-00005 (ZC)**

1. Development of the subject property shall be in substantial conformance with the applicant's representations of the project, including the site plan, letter of intent, and all other supporting documents submitted, as reviewed, modified, and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council.
2. The zoning for this property shall allow for a maximum of 110 lodging units and 40 multifamily housing units. No further splits or subdivision of the property is permitted.
3. Prior to the issuance of grading and building permits, the applicant shall enter into a Development Agreement with the City of Sedona that covers, at a minimum, the following items:
  - a. Availability of all 40 of the multifamily units for long term rental.
  - b. Availability of a minimum of 28 of the multifamily units to those working within the City limits of Sedona and making no more than 80% of the Area Median Income.
  - c. Management of parking areas, including non-guest use of hotel amenities (restaurant, bar, meeting facility), and measures to be taken if parking becomes an issue for the project.
  - d. Development and ongoing management of the property in compliance with the commitments made in the Letter of Intent, specifically the Sustainability/Green Building Section of the LOI.
4. The zoning for the subject property from Commercial and Multi-Family to Lodging shall be considered vested when the Development Agreement is approved, executed, and recorded, all other conditions are met, and construction of the project as approved under PZ19-00005 (DEV) is complete. If the applicant does not complete construction of the approved project within 5 Years of approval, execution, and recordation of the Development Agreement, the City may initiate proceedings to revoke approval of the zoning change, subject to the provisions of Sedona Land Development Code Section 8.6.A(3)g.2 and applicable State statutes.
5. Within thirty days of approval of the zone change, the property owner of record of the subject property voluntarily agrees to sign and record a waiver acknowledging their waiver of any right to claim just compensation for diminution in value under A.R.S. §12-1134 related to the granting of this Zoning Change approval.

---

### **PZ19-00005 (DEV)**

1. If the City Council does not approve PZ19-00005 (ZC), this development review approval shall become null and void.
2. Development of the subject property shall be in substantial conformance with the applicant's representations of the project, including the letter of intent, site plan, building plans and elevations,

landscape plan, and all other supporting documents, as reviewed, modified, and approved by the Planning & Zoning Commission. Proposed changes determined to be substantial by the Community Development Director shall require reconsideration by the Planning & Zoning Commission at a public meeting.

3. The project shall be constructed in a single phase.
  - a. Construction of all of the multifamily housing units shall be completed and certificates of occupancy issued before a certificate of occupancy is issued for any portion of the lodging use.
4. The exterior colors and materials shall be in compliance with the submitted color and materials board. Alternate colors proposed by the applicant may be approved by the Director if the colors are darker than the approved colors and meet all other Land Development Code requirements.
  - a. Based on the application of alternate standards and the colors presented at the public hearing, all buildings shall be limited to a maximum Light Reflectance Value (LRV) of 21%.
5. The plans submitted for building permits shall comply with all applicable Land Development Code requirements and incorporate the following changes from the plans reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission:
  - a. Site plan shall be coordinated with the most up-to-date survey and all structures shall meet all required setbacks, measured from the ROW line or the roadway easement.
  - b. Plans shall include a detailed breakdown of building and lot coverage, showing a maximum of 60% building coverage and 80% lot coverage, and ensuring all site elements are accounted for.
  - c. Largest unrelieved building planes on Lobby Building, Treehouse Suites, West Wing, North Wing, and Multi-family North shall be limited to 400 square feet. The largest unrelieved building planes on East Wing shall be limited to 450 square feet.
    - i. Windows and doors shall count towards the unrelieved building plane area unless they are recessed or project by a minimum of 1 foot.
  - d. Areas applying the height exception for mechanical equipment shall be setback a minimum of 6' from all roof edges.
  - e. Loading areas shall be screened in compliance with LDC Section 5.6.D(3).
  - f. Plans shall comply with massing requirements, including the following:
    - i. All buildings shall have a minimum of 3 masses in both plan and elevation view. (LDC Section 5.7.F(2)) Building modifications to meet massing requirements shall not bring the building out of compliance with height requirements.
    - ii. The ground-floor level of each façade facing a public street or other public area such as a plaza, park, or sidewalk shall contain a minimum of 30 percent windows or doorways. Upper floors of each façade facing a public street shall contain a minimum of 15 percent windows. (LDC Section 5.7.F(2)c.5). Areas of windows and doors behind a solid wall that is incorporated into the building design, making that portion of the window or door not visible from the public street/public area shall not count towards this calculation.
  - g. Plans shall comply with lighting requirements, including the following:
    - i. Lighting on the lower level of the parking structure shall be considered Class 2 lighting and limited to a maximum Correlated Color Temperature (CCT) of 2700K.

- ii. Sign lighting shall be added to the lighting plan and comply with all applicable requirements. Overall site lighting shall not exceed maximum lumen levels when sign lighting is added.
- h. A complete master sign plan shall be submitted, including the following:
  - i. Detailed information for all proposed signs, to allow for review for compliance with sign types, sizes, locations, heights, etc. The master sign plan shall comply with all Land Development Code requirements, except those that may be modified by the Director. If a standard may be modified by the Director, the master sign plan shall include details for that request for review and potential approval by the Director. Any modification to a standard that requires approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission shall be applied for as an amendment to the Development Review approval and heard by the Commission at a public hearing.
  - i. The total number of sewer connections shall be reduced to a number acceptable to the Public Works Department.
- 6. All vents, down spouts, gutters, posts, etc. shall be painted to match the exterior wall or roof color or be in compliance with the color provisions of the Land Development Code.
- 7. All landscaping shall be maintained to ensure visibility triangle requirements are met at the driveway entrances and intersection.
- 8. All exterior mechanical equipment shall be screened and/or painted to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.
- 9. The applicant shall obtain Right-of-Way Permits from the City of Sedona and/or the Arizona Department of Transportation for any work in the Right-of-Way.
- 10. Hours of work, for grading operations, shall be limited to 7 a.m. to 6 p.m., Monday through Friday and 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday. No grading work shall occur on Sunday.
- 11. Prior to the issuance of grading and building permits, staff shall verify that all plans submitted for buildings permits are in substantial accordance with the plans as submitted, reviewed, and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission and meet the following conditions, and the applicant shall provide written documentation of such compliance to staff:
  - a. All plans shall comply with all applicable sections of the Land Development Code and the Development Review application as reviewed and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission, subject to the following modifications/additional information:
  - b. Provide Final Grading and Drainage Plans. The Site Plan shall meet the grading and drainage requirements of the Sedona Land Development Code and the Design Review, Engineering, and Administrative Manual (DREAM). A trench drain is recommended at the bottom of slopes and driveways to prevent flooding buildings and roads.
  - c. Provide Final Drainage Report.
  - d. Per the geotechnical report, retaining wall or building foundations to be constructed in close proximity to retention basins (within 5.0 feet) should be embedded 1.0 feet deeper than the stated depths in the bearing capacity tables.
  - e. Accessible sidewalks and parking areas will need to meet the current US Dept. of Justice ADA requirements.
  - f. Accessible parking/signage shall meet the requirements of the City LDC and DREAM documents.

- g. For projects involving grading of more than 5,000 cubic yards, a haul plan, a dust control plan, a topsoil reutilization plan, a stormwater pollution prevention plan, and a traffic control plan shall be required. Each must be acceptable to and approved by the City Engineer. (Dream 3.1.H.6.i).
  - h. For Projects involving grading of more than 5,000 cubic yards, an assurance bond is required per Manual Section 3.1.G.1.
  - i. Applicant shall provide a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. SWPPP measures shall be in place prior to the start of construction (DREAM 3.1). Storm water quality measures shall also comply with City of Sedona Code requirements (City Code Chapter 13.5)
  - j. The plans shall delineate oil separators for all paved surfaces prior to its release into the City's storm sewer system. Manufacturer or engineer's specifications and a maintenance schedule shall be provided.
  - k. Construction details shall be provided for sewer construction/connection. Existing sewer laterals that are not utilized by the development shall be abandoned.
  - l. Provide utility construction details on plans.
  - m. A copy of the ADEQ Approval to Construct Water Facilities and Wastewater Facilities shall be provided prior to construction.
  - n. The applicant shall submit landscaping plans that comply with all applicable City codes and the approved landscaping plans.
  - o. The applicant shall submit outdoor lighting plans that comply with all applicable City codes and the approved lighting plan.
  - p. All requirements of the Sedona Fire District shall be satisfied.
  - q. All concrete within the City ROW shall be colored "Sedona Red" (Davis 160 color).
12. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, staff shall verify that all construction is in substantial accordance with the plans as submitted, reviewed, and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission, and meets the following conditions:
- a. The property owner shall record a cross access easement and maintenance agreement with Yavapai County for the new connector road and the connection through the parking structure to Elk Road. The easement shall also include any areas where the proposed sidewalks along Saddlerock Circle, W State Route 89A, and Elk Road encroach onto private property. The easement shall be provided for vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle access and the easement language shall be reviewed and approved by City Staff prior to recordation.
  - b. The property owner shall grant and record an easement for an underground odor control bio filter along Saddlerock Circle. The easement shall be reviewed and approved by City Staff prior to recordation.
  - c. All on-site improvements shall substantially conform to the plans on which grading and building permits were issued.
  - d. Wayfinding signs shall be installed in the locations described in the Letter of Intent. Information on the wayfinding signs shall be coordinated with and approved by City Staff prior to installation.
  - e. Installation of all proposed landscaping shall be complete and in accordance with the approved landscape plan.

- f. All outside lighting shall have been installed in accordance with the approved plans. All lighting sources shall be fully shielded so that the direct illumination is confined to the subject property boundaries and so no light is directed above the horizontal plane. Staff shall conduct a night inspection and if deemed necessary, additional shielding will be required.
  - g. The project shall meet the requirements of Sedona Land Development Code Section 5.9 (Public Art). If the applicant intends to do an on-site installation, a public artwork plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Community Development Director prior to fabrication and installation of the proposed artwork.
  - h. All new utility lines shall be provided through underground installation.
  - i. All mechanical equipment and trash receptacles shall be completely screened from surrounding areas by use of a wall, fence, landscaping or shall be enclosed within a building. All electrical panels shall be located so as not to be visible from public rights-of-way.
  - j. All requirements of the Sedona Fire District shall be satisfied.
  - k. The applicant shall provide copies of all required testing to the Engineering Department.
  - l. As-built plans shall be provided to the City in digital and hard copy formats acceptable to the City Engineer.
  - m. An elevation Certificate from an Arizona Registered Land Surveyor is required for each building.
  - n. All areas of cut and fill shall be landscaped or dressed in such a manner as to reduce the potential for erosion.
  - o. The applicant shall provide a letter, sealed by the engineer of record, verifying that the work, as done, is in substantial accordance with the approved plans.
  - p. All construction shall comply with the Storm Water Regulations in Chapter 13.5 of the City of Sedona City Code. Storm water quantities and velocities shall not be greater than the historic values at the downstream property line.
13. Within thirty days of approval of the Development Review, the property owners of record of the subject properties shall sign and record a waiver acknowledging their waiver of any right to claim just compensation for diminution in value under A.R.S. §12-1134 related to the granting of this Development Review.



## Kyle Sandidge

---

**From:** donotreply@sedonaaz.gov  
**Sent:** Friday, November 10, 2023 7:29 AM  
**To:** Cari Meyer; Kyle Sandidge; Megan Yates  
**Subject:** Comment on Development Proposal

A new entry to a form/survey has been submitted.

**Form Name:** Comments on Development Proposals  
**Date & Time:** 11/10/2023 7:28 a.m.  
**Response #:** 440  
**Submitter ID:** 6129  
**IP address:** 2601:19e:8380:2f33:2572:a627:b31b:904d  
**Time to complete:** 5 min. , 52 sec.

---

### Survey Details

Page 1

---

**We want to hear what you think. Please share your thoughts below. If you have questions about the project, please enter your contact information so that we can respond. Please note that all information submitted (including name and addresses) will become part of the public record and will be available for public inspection.**

**1. Project Name:**

Village at Saddlerock

**2. What are your comments, concerns, ideas, and suggestions about this project?**

Concerns about the south building. It is quite close to the residential properties. It should be swapped places with the parking garage to provide a buffer to the residential neighborhood.  
Having second story balconies will create noise and light pollution in the surrounding properties. Can they be moved to the front of the design? The height is out of place with the surrounding buildings.  
Are these condos? Long term rentals? STRs? Can they be subletted?  
I am very concerned about late night activity on the property in general (for light and sound) A roof top pool seems to asking for loud gatherings late into the night. And there is little control over what will happen in the residential buildings and placing them so close to the Valley View properties is asking for problems. 2 story buildings right next to classic 1 story Sedona houses a bad idea. If the upper story is just bedrooms there is a slight chance it would not create as much problems, but living rooms and an outside deck towering above our property is a poor design.

**3. Your contact information**

**Name:** Allan Sirotkin  
**Mailing Address:** 115 VALLEY VIEW DR  
**E-mail:** allan@grchocolates.com

**4. Would you like to receive notices about this project, such as public meeting dates?**

Yes

Thank you,  
**City of Sedona**

---

**This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.**

## Kyle Sandidge

---

**From:** donotreply@sedonaaz.gov  
**Sent:** Friday, November 10, 2023 8:33 AM  
**To:** Cari Meyer; Kyle Sandidge; Megan Yates  
**Subject:** Comment on Development Proposal

A new entry to a form/survey has been submitted.

**Form Name:** Comments on Development Proposals  
**Date & Time:** 11/10/2023 8:32 a.m.  
**Response #:** 441  
**Submitter ID:** 6130  
**IP address:** 47.215.242.182  
**Time to complete:** 42 min. , 21 sec.

---

### Survey Details

Page 1

**We want to hear what you think. Please share your thoughts below. If you have questions about the project, please enter your contact information so that we can respond. Please note that all information submitted (including name and addresses) will become part of the public record and will be available for public inspection.**

**1. Project Name:**

The Village at Saddlerock Crossing

**2. What are your comments, concerns, ideas, and suggestions about this project?**

Hello:

I am a full time Sedona resident who retired as a Technical Fellow from The Aerospace Corporation in El Segundo, California. While I have tried to make my comments understandable to anyone, they likely require someone with an Engineering knowledge to get to the details. The overall observation is that there is a "devil in the details" depth to the proposed "traffic solution" which may not be apparent at this point, and, if not evaluated, may turn out to become a future problem at a time when it is demonstrated and may not be solved in the future

Here are my comments pertaining to the use of the Saddlerock Circle (SRC) road to the Soldier's pass intersection and light:

As mentioned in the Nov 7/2023 meeting. the intent is to put a "pork chop" at the corner of 89A and Saddlerock Circle. This was based on an ADOT recommendation to eliminate the turn from SRC to 89A Westbound. The alternative would be the proposed connector from SRC to the Soldier's Pass light going through the Hotel grounds. This was presented as an "improvement", and, after performing a cursory simulation of the impacts to traffic flow, I believe that there is a more complex cause/effect of this condition based on the following observations:

SRC traffic is usually light (I drive by all the time and don't recall having seen more than 3-4 cars "backed up") with few (maybe ~ 30-50%) turning West on 89A. We normally use Airport Road to get the protected left turn at the light, in particular at peak hours. Off peak hours it becomes a "driver's choice" for me, but, all in all turning East is a much easier and faster solution. The West turn is made by landing on the middle (2 way turn lane) on 89A, which sometimes is occupied by Eastbound 89A drivers wishing to turn left (into the Whole Foods lot)

It is understandable that there would be a need for a "pork chop" to avoid left turns if the Soldiers Pass light were to become a 4 direction signal, (it is 3 directions now) However, the amount of traffic which would be added to the South side Soldier's Pass road which would enter 89A in both directions or continue straight to Soldier's Pass (ie drive to the Dog Park) is not trivial. There will be more units added to the flow than there are homes in Saddlerock subdivision (~105 homes, with ~35 being Airb'n'b and not being fully occupied). The addition of the hotel plus the housing will more than double the traffic flowing out of the South end of the Soldier's pass Road into the 89A/Soldier's Pass north end. The traffic is expected to triple, and, in peak hours, the backlog of cars can be in the order of 10-15 vehicles waiting for a light change. This will block some of the cross traffic within the hotel property, as well as create a more frequent traffic light flow distribution (how many times the light changes, how long is the 89A traffic further slowed down. Today, the light is triggered by sensors, and it barely changes unless pedestrians try to cross or a line of cars coming from Soldier's Pass Road stack to turn left to 89A East. Initial quick calculations show that the traffic stoppage (red lights) on 89A is going to increase significantly and this will drive consequences to the Airport Road light Under extreme conditions (when Sedona has a high visitor count and 89A traffic is heavy, there are secondary consequences to the proposed 4 point intersection, and, it will likely result in a backlog of cars in the Project's area, where local pedestrian traffic within the hotel is expected to add to the situation.

Also, it is apparent to me that the Project will attempt to put stop signs (ADOT will likely require) and speed bumps to "minimize" (or deter in perhaps a passive aggressive form) traffic from SRC turning into the Soldier's Pass South extension. It is a simple deduction/conclusion that the hotel will likely get adverse reviews if people were to comment that there is a primary street used to turner West on 89A (and some will also turn East) which basically bisects the hotel property. This is basically the equivalent of driving through a parking lot to get from point A to B and we know that parking lots use speed bumps to control speed and flow of traffic.

The proposed road bypass should have the same features as the current road and should not be encumbered with speed bumps or an extreme amount of stop signs whose purpose would be listed as "protecting pedestrians" but, which is likely a way to keep the small SRC traffic away from the Hotel property.

I did a preliminary evaluation of the comparison between leaving SRC alone, and not have it connected at all to the South end of Soldier's Pass road, but, it is clear that the addition of the Hotel/housing traffic, even if treated as a "dead headed traffic flow" with no physical connection to the Saddlerock Subdivision, will not be practical, as that flow still has to access 89A. Based on that, I concluded that the proposed re routing is a better solution, but, as I have described here, I have concerns for the impact to the East /West Flow on 89A, which should perhaps be modeled with a more comprehensive traffic flow model (I have used simulated fluid flow models but it is very difficult to calibrate to traffic flow, as my parameters are compressibility, viscosity, etc.. The models I have written for my career, and it is not meant to make traffic simulations, although I can see trends which I have tried to relate anecdotally). I strongly suggest a licensed Engineer use a more established flow models to see impacts (pressure buildup in the 89A main flow channel in my model equating to traffic slowdown and traffic stacking) when increasing the amount of time the light changes. In addition, getting down to the brass tacks detail, I also encourage the City Engineering staff to inquire (details were not given on the presentation) as to the internal traffic flow control plans which the developer will be using (stop signs, speed bumps, etc) as it is apparent to me that the true intent of the developer is to "advertise" a connector to Soldier's Pass Road, but, in reality would be forcing the entire Saddlerock Neighborhood to use Airport Road and avoid going through the Hotel area. As such, I would strongly encourage detailed discussion and the requirement for these limits to be defined and "locked in place" so the Engineering team has a chance to see if the Southern Part of the Soldier's Pass road is really a street made for both vehicle and pedestrian traffic, or perhaps intended to be a "dead headed" access point to Hotel and housing parking.

**3. Your contact information**

**Name:** Bernardo Higuera  
**Mailing Address:** 220 Rockridge Dr, Sedona, 86336  
**E-mail:** bhiguera@yahoo.com

**4. Would you like to receive notices about this project, such as public meeting dates?**

(o) Yes

Thank you,  
City of Sedona

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

## Megan Yates

---

**From:** donotreply@sedonaaz.gov  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 24, 2024 6:50 PM  
**To:** Cari Meyer; Kyle Sandidge; Megan Yates  
**Subject:** Comment on Development Proposal

A new entry to a form/survey has been submitted.

**Form Name:** Comments on Development Proposals  
**Date & Time:** 01/24/2024 6:49 p.m.  
**Response #:** 447  
**Submitter ID:** 6329  
**IP address:** 47.215.240.16  
**Time to complete:** 7 min. , 10 sec.

---

### Survey Details

#### Page 1

---

**We want to hear what you think. Please share your thoughts below. If you have questions about the project, please enter your contact information so that we can respond. Please note that all information submitted (including name and addresses) will become part of the public record and will be available for public inspection.**

#### 1. Project Name:

The Village of Saddlerock Crossing

#### 2. What are your comments, concerns, ideas, and suggestions about this project?

Concerns: Why is there a sidewalk needed from "Solider Pass Corridor" going to Valley View Drive. We are trying to DISCOURAGE tourist and non-residents of the subdivision from going into the subdivision, so why put the sidewalk in?

-why do you need an exit from Solider Pass Corridor onto the Saddlerock Circle road (near Junebug). There is a potential of 110 visitor cars and 40 family ++ cars to turn into the Saddlerock subdivision. They also will block the access onto 89A. You already have two exits from the site, The one onto Solider Pass and the other one on that commercial Elks Road. Why make a third exit into the residential area?

If the above is going to happen, what benefit will the local subdivision residents have? Access to the pool? Discounts??

#### 3. Your contact information

**Name:** Nancy Hashim  
**Mailing Address:** 500 Saddlerock Circle, Sedona AZ 86336  
**E-mail:** nancyjsa7@yahoo.com

#### 4. Would you like to receive notices about this project, such as public meeting dates?

(o) Yes

Thank you,  
**City of Sedona**

---

**This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.**

## Saddlerock Homes Concerns - PZ19-00005 (ZC, DEV) Village at Saddlerock Crossing

Mitch Laurich <mitchlaurich@yahoo.com>

Tue 1/30/2024 11:57 AM

To: Cari Meyer <CMeyer@sedonaaz.gov>

Dear Planning & Zoning:

As a property owner in the Saddlerock Homes neighborhood directly adjacent to the proposed Village at Saddlerock Crossing project, I have grave concerns. I was disappointed in the Planning and Zoning Commission's November decision to move the project along, against city staff's recommendation, in effect giving trust to a developer who has not earned any; who has in fact consistently and blatantly ignored staff guidance and recommendations and legal requirements while taking years to move forward with each review. The new application and changes in city codes adversely impacting the developer at this stage are the responsibility of the developer themselves for taking so long to move forward. In fact, so many iterations seemed like completely new projects that should have required the developer to start the approval process and required evaluations and notifications anew instead of from where they left off at their prior meeting however many years prior.

Indeed, everyone I have spoken with about this development believes it was canceled and has long ago stopped paying attention. In this time, our neighborhood has lost our HOA and become besieged by short-term rentals. By my calculations approximately 34% of the properties in Saddlerock Homes have changed ownership since 2020 when the developer last reached out to the neighborhood -- and three more homes are or will be for sale shortly, representing a 36% change. Many other property owners are very elderly and/or absent. The city sent notices recently, but I only received mine last week. Most importantly, it appears that the current proposed development is very much a new project since outreach to our neighborhood was undertaken in a serious way and since other stakeholders were consulted regarding infrastructure and other important factors. Also note that the participants who came forward at the last meeting to comment positively are all businesses who stand to financially profit from this development, and one who directly rents parking for events across the street. At the very least, the developer should be required to do more neighborhood outreach to mitigate neighborhood impacts before any further decisions are made.

Some initial thoughts - one big example of a seriously adverse impact is the plan for an 1,800sf lounge - outdoors and upstairs. The noise and light pollution alone will substantially harm the quality of life in our neighborhood and should not be allowed. Our neighborhood is impacted by Posse Grounds lighting and events - I can only imagine how we would be impacted by this proposed outdoor upstairs lounge right at the end of our street. Another example are the height restriction violations, with the developer designing the highest buildings right in the viewshed of our neighborhood where it will have the most adverse impact. Roof mounted equipment will likely have further adverse effects. The entrance to the hotel off of Saddlerock Circle is undesirably at the farthest point into our neighborhood and I have concerns about the impact of the proposed bus zone closest to the neighborhood in terms of noise and pollution and that will likely also become a loading zone. Also importantly, this development will likely create a new traffic bottleneck on 89A at Soldier's Pass. Compared to other uses that bring existing traffic to the neighborhood, lodging will bring new traffic to the city overall, thereby exacerbating the horrific traffic congestion that is already such a problem.

I respectfully urge the commission to slow down and fully engage more due diligence in evaluating the impact of this development on the Saddlerock Homes and surrounding neighborhoods, as well as on the

city. The timeframe since the last meeting were holidays when residents and citizens were even further disengaged due to the holidays. At the very least, please require the outdoor, upstairs lounge to be changed to an enclosed, indoors only room... require strict compliance with all height restrictions and placement... require the developer to do more neighborhood outreach to identify and mitigate neighborhood impacts as the project stands now, before any further decisions are made... require the developer to plan and submit everything spelled out in writing and fully enforceable.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Mitch Laurich  
160 Saddlrock Ln  
Sedona AZ 86336